

THE BC

AMERICAN

CATHOLIC QUARTERLY

REVIEW.

Bonum est homini ut eum veritas vincat volentem, quia malum est homini ut eum veritas vincat invitum. Nam ipsa vincat necesse est, sive negantem sive confitentem.

S. AUG. EPIST. cccxxviii, AD PASCENT.

VOLUME XIV.

FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER, 1889.

PHILADELPHIA:
HARDY & MAHONY,
PUBLISHERS AND PROPRIETORS,
505 CHESTNUT STREET.

THE
AMERICAN
CATHOLIC QUARTERLY
REVIEW
COPYRIGHT, 1889,

BY

HARDY & MAHONY.
VOLUME XIV
THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOL. XIV.—APRIL, 1889.—No. 54.

MYTHS AND LEGENDS OF THE "REFORMATION."

HOW much light modern research has thrown on the Middle Ages is known to all students of history. They also know how strong has been the testimony borne by modern scholarship to the beneficent activity of the Popes and the Church in those often misjudged times. In the October number of the REVIEW we have given some of the most striking results of modern investigation on this period. The aim of the article referred to, however, was not only to throw light on the "Dark" Ages; it was broader and more comprehensive. Our aim was to prove to our readers, by an appeal to the facts, that the Church has nothing to fear, but much to hope, from historical science. Lest, however, the premises appear too narrow for this conclusion, we shall extend our researches, and study another great historical question, the question of the "Reformation."

Of course, we shall not enter into an examination of Luther's doctrines, of their truth or consistency. This is foreign to our purpose, and besides it is useless to slay the dead; Luther's most cardinal doctrine, that of justification by faith alone, was buried by his own disciples centuries ago, and not a few of his other doctrines have followed that to the grave. To-day the world is little interested in Luther the constructive theologian; but the history of Luther's movements has by no means lost its interest. No book, of late, has so exasperated and dismayed the German supporters of the "Reformation" as Janssen's "History of the German

People." Still Janssen never enters into theological discussions, never attempts to analyze or refute Luther's teachings. Whence, therefore, the dismay of the "Reformer's" friends? Because Janssen mildly and mercilessly demolishes the traditional Luther; because historical truth compelled him to draw attention to some very inconvenient features in Luther's career. In the nineteenth century, in the days of the Rothschilds and the Bleichröders, it is inconvenient for his followers to be regaled with an authentic picture of the "Reformer's" brutal intolerance, not only of Catholics—that would not have stung the men of the *Cultur-Kampf*—but of Jews; in the days of the new German empire it is inconvenient to be reminded of the "Reformer's" repeated faithlessness to the old German empire; in the days of Deroulède and the French Patriotic League it is inconvenient to read of the "Reformer's" approval of the coquetting, nay, the alliance of his friends with Germany's arch-enemy. The "Reformation" meant tolerance, we have heard re-echoed in every key, major and minor. But the arch-"reformer's" own words prove him a brutal denouncer of Catholic, Calvinist, and Jew. Luther was the great German patriot, sang his admirers in loud chorus. Alas! that men's writing will live after them; for Luther had written himself down—well, we shall not use harsh words—a friend of Germany's hereditary foe. Strange, indeed, and unlikely does it appear that error and falsehood should entwine themselves around so public, so stupendous a series of events as that comprised in the word "Reformation." But history cannot be based on assumptions, and the new historical school takes nothing for granted. Already it has overhauled a great part of what passed for the history of the "Reformation." It has re-examined old witnesses, and brought new witnesses on the stand. It has put aside second-hand authorities, and gone to the sources. And though it is hard for human nature to lay aside long-cherished opinions, even non-Catholic followers of the new school have not wilfully closed their eyes to the light, nor sealed their lips, when truth brushed away the inherited error of ages. We shall review a few of their conclusions.

"At one time," says Prof. K. Pearson, "not only the German Protestants believed, but leading Protestant historians stated as a fact, that Luther had translated the Bible for the first time. Then when the existence of eighteen previous editions (printed German translations are meant) could no longer be disguised, it was broadly hinted that they never reached the people, that they were based only on the Vulgate, that the language is awkward, heavy, and neither precise in sense nor happy in expression.¹ So Goedeke.

¹ Prof. Pearson here gives the German text: "Die Sprache ist unbeholfen schwerfällig und weder genau im Sinn noch treffend im Ausdruck."

This was met by the proof that their language was a perfect mine of folk-expression, homely and true; nay, further, it was shown that Luther, so far from translating from the original Greek, had in the New Testament, to a great extent, only modernized the old German Vulgate. The September Bible was only a natural growth out of the version of the *Codex Teplensis* of the fourteenth century."¹ "Where Luther does differ from the (pre-'Reformation') German Vulgate is very often in those passages in which his own strong sense of the righteousness of his own dogma has led him to pervert the text. Against Emser's 2400 'heretical errors, lies, and wrong tense-renderings,' I may cite Bunsen's 3000 inaccuracies. . . . Mr. Hutchinson tells us that Luther probably began Greek in 1512. We happen to know that he began it in August, 1518. Let me cite what was written two years ago, and remind the reader that to *revise*, not translate, cost our thorough Greek scholars ten years' work, 1870-1880. On the 25th of August, 1518, Melancthon arrived in Wittenberg; then, for the first time, Luther, attending the lectures of Melancthon, began to study Greek. This is shown not only by Luther's letters, but Melancthon in a speech to the students, recommending the study of Greek, points out to them Luther's example in Luther himself, who, already advanced in years (*quamvis jam senex*), has learned the Greek tongue. In June, 1519, we have the famous Leipzig disputation with Eck, and in April, 1521, Luther arrives in Worms; he is in bitter and prolonged controversy with Eck and Emser, he is writing book after book against the Pope and his bull, and he is contesting the condemnation of the leading universities of Christendom. In 1520 alone he publishes three epoch-making works, and yet he must find time to study Greek. On December 21st, 1521, Luther wrote to Lange of his determination to translate the New Testament, and within a less period than three months the work is completed. Returning on March 1st from the Wartburg to Wittenberg, he managed to review the translation with Melancthon notwithstanding the Carlstadt difficulties, and on the 21st of September the New Testament is issued completed from the press. To translate, revise, and print occupied less than nine months, and this notwithstanding Luther's three most broken years of Greek study. Does not such external evidence fully confirm internal coincidences and point to Luther's dependence on his predecessors?"²

"Luther," says Paulsen, "appreciated the old (classical) writers, especially the Roman, which were almost the only classics he knew."³ "The Greek authors," says O. Schmidt, in a pamphlet

¹ K. Pearson in *Academy* of September 26th, 1885.

² K. Pearson in *Academy* of October 10th, 1885, pp. 240-1.

³ Paulsen, *l. c.*, p. 147.

on "Luther's acquaintance with the Classics," "were little known to him."¹

The fact that in Germany at least fourteen high-German and four low-German translations of the Bible had been printed before the "Reformation" could no longer be denied. It was a bitter dose for the old-fashioned worshippers of Luther. Must they concede that their prophet was wrong? that he had slandered the Catholic Church? that the Church had not withheld from her children the saving nourishment of the Bible? It was too much to expect such an admission at once. They set their wits to work, and lo! they thought they had found a way to escape the disagreeable inference. The eighteen editions were printed—that could not be denied; the books were in evidence. But were they printed by Catholics and for Catholics? Was the translation a Catholic translation? For whom, suggested common sense, if not for Catholics should they be printed? Was not Germany, as a whole, Catholic before Luther? The censorship of books existed in the electorate of Mainz since 1486, and Archbishop Berthold, of Mainz, bid the censors withhold their approval from books "if perchance they cannot be correctly translated, if they rather beget scandal and error, or offend modesty." Nevertheless, twelve out of the eighteen German Bible translations were printed in the province of Mainz. Were the censors asleep? or how could fourteen editions of a heretical Bible be published there, and for heretics, too?

Serious difficulties these. Still they did not appal the zealous defenders of Luther. In 1885 a Protestant clergyman, Keller by name, published a work on "The Reformation and the Older Reform Parties." He had made a discovery. "The opinion heretofore prevailing, that the German Bible translation sprang from orthodox Roman Catholic sources, is wholly false; the German people owes it to the Bible-believing heretics, the Waldensians." Protestant critics, even such as otherwise condemned the book without mercy, admitted this conclusion. Keller's arguments, however, were by no means convincing. So, in the same year, Dr. H. Haupt published a new work to correct and complete the reasoning. But, alas! for the futility of human endeavors! Scarcely had Haupt placed his book before the public when forthwith comes forward another non-Catholic, Dr. Franz Jostes,¹ and topples over the beautifully constructed house of cards. Keller's and Haupt's arguments, external and internal, are tested and found to

¹ Quoted by Paulsen on the same page.

² Dr. F. Jostes, *Die Waldenser und die vorlutherische deutsche Bibelübersetzung*. Münster, 1885.

be based on imagination and ignorance. "The writer" (Jostes), says Prof. Pearson, "subjects the Keller-Haupt hypothesis to a fairly searching criticism, which will do much to assuage that sectarian enthusiasm which has swept through the Protestant press of Germany. . . . We shall note with some curiosity whether the remarkable interest, recently manifested by Lutheran theologians for the pre-Lutheran Vulgate, will now begin to subside."

So much for the German pre-Lutheran Bible translations. But what of Haupt's assertion that the Church had forbidden wholly the use of Bible translations? It is true that in certain places and for good reasons certain translations were forbidden in the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries. But "in Spain only were Spanish translations generally prohibited by *royal* edict since the end of the thirteenth century."¹ "In Germany, the only prohibition (which was no prohibition at all) is contained in a decree of Berthold, Archbishop of Mainz, establishing a preventive censorship."² "By the Council of Trent, and not before, the use of German Bibles by laymen was greatly restricted, though not wholly forbidden. But the proscription was by many not regarded as binding. The Bavarian catalogue of forbidden books for 1566, for example, mentions among the most useful books for laymen the Bibles of Eck and Dietenberger, the New Testament of Emser, and the very old translation of the Bible or of some extracts therefrom. . . . which, however, are not often printed now. As late as 1612 the Jesuit Serarius says: "If anyone in Germany reads without special permission the Bible of Eck or Dietenberger, this is not only not censured or punished by bishops, pastors, and confessors, but rather approved and praised, as if a general permission had been given."³

How bitterly opposed Catholic priests were to the reading of the Bible in the fifteenth century may be inferred from a fact recorded at Leyden, in the Netherlands, at that time a part of the German Emperor's possessions. "There, in the year 1462, Willem Heerman, a respected burgher, presented to the city a copy of the complete German Bible, prepared by his own hand. This copy was placed in St. Peter's Church for the use of 'all good honest men, who wish to read therein and study something good.' During the Middle Ages the churches were always open throughout the day."⁴ "Regarding the spread of our old Bible translation," says W. Moll, Professor of Protestant Theology at Amsterdam, "we can report but little. As far as the lay world is concerned it was

¹ Reusch, *Index der verbotenen Bücher*, vol. i., p. 43, quoted in Jostes, *Die Waldenser*, p. 21. Reusch is an Old Catholic.

² Jostes, *l. c.*, p. 22.

³ Jostes, *l. c.*, p. 231.

⁴ Jostes, *l. c.*, p. 281.

probably most often used in women's convents, in Beguin houses, and in assemblies of Sisters of the Common Life, and moreover in men's convents, which, besides monks, also included uneducated lay brothers. That since the middle of the fifteenth century it existed in many, if not in all, convents, either complete or in extracts, is likely in view of the copies which exist in our public and private libraries, which are numerous, and generally bear the proofs of coming from convents."¹ The history of the French Bible during the Middle Ages has recently been traced by M. Samuel Berger in his work, *La Bible Française au Moyen Age*. He found a French version of the books of Samuel and the Kings dating back as early as 1150 A.D. In the thirteenth century the whole Bible was translated, some books being accompanied with a commentary. "About 1300 A.D., Desmoulins, Canon of Aire in Anjou, wrote in the Picard dialect his '*Bible Historiale*,' made up of the text of the Bible with some omissions and a free translation of the *Historia Scholastica* of Petrus Comestor. . . . The first volume of Desmoulins, and the second volume of the Century Bible, make up the received French Bibles of the Middle Ages, which spread in countless copies over Europe, from England to Italy."² Here, too, as recently in Germany, the Waldenses were called in to account for the numerous French Bibles. "During this period" (eleventh century to St. Louis), says Mr. Wicksteed in the same article, "falls that attack on the Bible readers of Metz under Innocent III., round which a romantic legend has grown up, tempting uncritical critics to identify every version of the Bible with the supposed work of Pierre Valdus, '*La Bible des Vaudois*.' M. Berger shows, with admirable diligence, that no such work ever existed. . . . So ends '*la Legende de la Bible des Vaudois*.'"³ In England the venerable Bede translated parts of the Scriptures as early as the eighth century, and the Psalms were translated by King Alfred. After the Norman Conquest, besides partial translations, we know of a complete one dated 1290, and in the fourteenth century the new version of John of Treviso was made. Such of our readers as desire to know more of the vernacular versions of the Bible we refer to Spalding's *History of the Reformation* (vol. i., p. 292). One more fact may be cited to show how false it is that the Church forbade the reading of the Bible. "How great a number of readers," says the Protestant Geffcken, "is presupposed by ninety-eight editions of the whole Latin Bible, which are catalogued by Hain up to A.D. 1500 as numbers 3031-3128." In the fifty years immediately succeeding the

¹ Moll, *Kerkgeschiedenis van Nederland vor de Hervorming*, ii., 334, quoted in Jostes, *l. c.*, p. 24.

² P. H. Wicksteed in *Academy*, No. 647.

³ Wicksteed in the same article.

invention of printing, so extensive a work as the Latin Bible—the complete Latin Bible—is published ninety-eight times, besides eighteen German translations, and men will still believe Luther's assertion, that "the Biblia were unknown to people under popery." "In the fifteenth century," says Prof. Pearson, "it (the Catholic Church) certainly did not hold back the Bible from the folk. And it gave them in the vernacular a long series of devotional works, which for language and religious sentiment have never been surpassed. Indeed, we are inclined to think it made a mistake in allowing the masses such ready access to the Bible. It ought to have recognized the Bible once and for all as a work absolutely unintelligible without a long course of historical study, and so long as it was supposed to be inspired, very dangerous in the hands of the ignorant."¹

The immorality of the ancient clergy has always been a favorite theme with the "Reformers" and their admirers. This immorality, we are told again and again, was undoubtedly one of the chief causes of the "Reformation." Let us hear, however, one of the best informed authorities on the condition of England in Henry VIII.'s time, the late Prof. Brewer. "Nor considering the temper of the English people, is it probable that immorality could have existed among the ancient clergy to the degree which the exaggeration of poets, preachers, and satirists might lead us to suppose. The existence of such corruption is not justified by authentic documents, or by an impartial and broad estimate of the character and conduct of the nation before the Reformation. There is nothing more difficult than for contemporaries to form, from their own limited experience, a just estimate of the morality of the times in which they live; and if the complaints of preachers and moralists are to be accepted as authoritative on this head, there would be no difficulty in producing abundant evidence from the Reformers themselves that the abuses and enormities of their own age under Edward VI. and Elizabeth were far greater than in the ages preceding."²

Later researches strongly support Prof. Brewer's views. The results of these researches are laid down chiefly in the Benedictine Dom Gasquet's work on "Henry VIII. and the Suppression of the English Monasteries," and in the tenth volume of the "Letters and Papers of the Reign of Henry VIII.," edited by James Gairdner. That sensitively moral monarch, bluff King Harry, appointed a commission to visit the monasteries, and it is chiefly on the strength of its report that the grossest vices have been imputed to

¹ Prof. Pearson in *Academy*, August 7th, 1886, p. 85.

² Brewer, "The Reign of Henry VIII.," vol. ii., p. 469.

the English monks of Henry's time by historian after historian. What is the verdict of scientific history on these charges? There is no more fair and competent authority on this period of English history and on this question than the Protestant editor of the records of the reign of Henry VIII., James Gairdner. Here is his opinion as laid down in a criticism of Dom Gasquet's work in the *Academy* of February 25th, 1888, p. 125. "A mysterious Black Book is supposed to have been compiled when the monasteries were visited in the reign of Henry VIII.; and such extraordinary revelations were then made of the dissolute lives of monks and nuns, that an indignant Parliament insisted on the suppression of these dens of vice. That the Black Book had disappeared with all its damning evidence, was a fact which occasioned no difficulty to a writer like Burnet, who found that in the reign of Queen Mary a commission was granted to Bonner and others to examine the records of "divers infamous scrutinies in religious houses." The commission itself, indeed, said nothing about the destruction of these records when found; but rather that they should be 'brought to knowledge.' Still it was clear to the Protestant mind (at least in the days of Bp. Burnet) that the only object of inquiring after such things could be to destroy the evidences of things casting such deep discredit on the papal system. Well, whatever may have become of the 'Black Book' itself, it is clear that the destruction of evidence could not have gone very far; for at least three or four documents still exist (and were referred to by Burton in his "Anatomy of Melancholy" long before Burnet wrote), giving a black enough account of the state of the monasteries in Henry VIII.'s time just before their suppression. These three or four separate documents were possibly intended to form parts of a comprehensive book reporting on monasteries throughout England; but altogether they embrace only certain districts, and it is clear only a minority of the houses are reported on even in these. These reports contain accusations of the foulest character—often of unmentionable crimes—against several of the inmates, in a considerable number of the houses. But they are accusations merely, unaccompanied by a particle of evidence to support them; and we know quite well now-a-days by whom and under what circumstances they were drawn up. They are in the hand-writing of John ap Rice, a notary who accompanied Cromwell's visitor, Dr. Legh, in the work of inspecting the monasteries; and we can distinctly trace in the correspondence of Dr. Legh himself and his fellow visitor, Dr. Layton, the dates at which each of these separate reports was transmitted to their master. . . . It appears that the whole work was done with such amazing rapidity that it is simply out of the question to suppose that anything like the

enormities reported were proved by anything like a judicial inquiry.

. . . . That the case against the monasteries was prejudiced, appears clearly from some of the letters of the visitors themselves. When Layton, in a fit of comparative honesty, had spoken well of the monastery of Glastonbury, he was admonished that his report did not give satisfaction; so he wrote immediately to apologize for his 'indiscreet praise,' acknowledging that the Abbott appeared 'neither to have known God, nor his prince, nor any part of a good Christian man's religion!' And to avoid a similar mistake at St. Mary's, York, he writes that he 'supposes to find evil disposition both in the Abbott and convent, whereof, God willing, I shall certify you in my next letters.' It is needless to say that the testimony of such an accuser is absolutely worthless. And as for his fellow, Dr. Legh—even his associate Ap Rice felt compelled to write to Cromwell of his tyranny and extortion, begging him at the same time not to disclose that he had done so, else his life would hardly be safe from the bullies and serving men in Legh's employment.

"Finally the accusations, when they had served their purpose, were discredited even by a royal commission issued immediately afterwards to report upon the condition of the monasteries with a view to their suppression. . . . Strange to say, the returns of this commission, so far as they have been collected hitherto, give the monks in almost all the houses a high character for probity, zeal, hospitality, and sometimes (we may add) for particular kinds of industry, such as writing, embroidery, or painting. Nor is this all; for it stands no less clearly recorded that several of these monasteries which look worst in the reports of the visitors, stood highest in the esteem of the neighbors—the country gentlemen who had the duty imposed upon them of making these returns. The huge mass of scandal compiled by Drs. Legh and Layton was clearly believed by no one, not even by the King or Cromwell, or, we may add, by the visitors themselves." "Something much worse than the grossest exaggerations," says the *Athenæum* (Feb. 18th, 1888), "something much more like impudent and enormous lying—is the rule and not the exception in the returns of the King's first inquisitors. . . . Perhaps the strongest impression that this (tenth) volume of the *Calendars* produces upon the reader is not that the history of Henry VIII. will have to be re-written, but that it has never been written at all."

So much on the corruption of the clergy in England. In Germany similar charges were first made against the clergy, and above all against the university men in the famous "*Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum*." These "obscure men," to wit, Ulrich von Hutten, Mutianus and his friends of the Erfurt University, where

Luther formed one of the circle, poured forth the most unmeasured abuse against the morals, the ignorance, and the shabby ragged dress of the university clergy. "Was this a true picture of the university men?" asks Prof. Paulsen. "As regards their hatred of poetry, of pure Latin, of the Greek language, in short of humanism, the account which follows will prove that the universities did not all deserve this reproach. As regards profligacy and disgraceful neglect of dress, no one will be surprised that then, as at all times, they were met with at the universities. About one circle of university men we are specially well informed on this point, the circle to which the authors of this satire belonged. What Mutianus, otherwise a respectable man, thought of sexual relations, we may read in the letters, hitherto unpublished, given by Janssen and Krause, in which he advises his young friends to help themselves. That Hutten needed no adviser on this point is well enough known. On the ragged appearance, poverty, and beggary of the same men (the dark men) the same works give us manifold, but by no means pleasant, information. It is strange that Strauss (the author of the "Life of Christ") could represent as the champion of human liberty and German culture the Franconian Knight (Von Hutten), who, wasting of a wretched disease, always penniless, but full of magnificent pretensions, roamed from place to place and stimulated the generosity of lords, spiritual and temporal, with Latin verses. But he assailed Rome. I think better weapons and better men were needed, and are still needed every day in the struggle for German liberty and culture."¹ How much faith the unblushing effrontery of Hutten and his friends deserves, it takes no Solomon to determine. On many other points of their indictment, Paulsen has convicted the "dark men" of exaggeration, falsehood, and slander. Is it rash to infer that they exaggerated on this point also? True, the leading "Reformers," many of whom were by no means vestal virgins, were mostly run-away monks and apostate priests; true, likewise, that the German clergy of the time, whose bishops were princes first, and, in not a few instances, princes first, last, and all the time—men who too often did not watch over their flocks and their pastors—were far less worthy men than the German clergy of to-day. On the other hand, we should not forget that opportunity makes thieves. Many of these men, in other more peaceful days, with no Luther and Carlstadt issuing trumpet call after trumpet call to monks and nuns, summoning them to cast aside their promises and break their vows, might have lived in honest obscurity, instead of becoming firebrands of scandal and preachers

¹ Paulsen, *l. c.*, p. 51.

of sedition. On the whole, then, whilst admitting many abuses, it is safe not to place implicit trust in the unblushing accusers of the Von Hutten type, and to make great allowance even when we read the invectives of honest satirists and zealous preachers.

Protestant historians of the past have generally represented the "Reformation" as a movement that swept over England and Germany like a whirlwind; the word "whirlwind" hardly did justice to the rapidity of the movement. It leaped from end to end of Germany like an electric flash. Reading these writers, you fancied the whole German and English peoples, standing like hungry birdlings, anxious to be fed with the pap of the new and pure "gospel." It was a heart-moving picture: it was more, it was an appeal to the jury on the *vox populi vox Dei* principle. In these days of universal suffrage, who could doubt that the "Reformers" were right, when they had the majority? But unluckily the muse of history cannot be won with sentimental imagery. She brushes the pictures away like cobwebs and probes the facts. And what are the facts? "The Reformation" (in England), says Prof. Brewer, "did not owe its origin to Tyndale or to Parliament, to the corruptions of the clergy or the oppression of the ecclesiastical courts. There is no reason to believe that the nation as a body was discontented with the old religion. Facts point to the opposite conclusion. Had it been so, Mary, whose attachment to the faith of her mother was well known, would never have been permitted to mount the throne or have found the task comparatively easy, seeing that the Reformers under Edward VI. had been suffered to have their own way unchecked and to displace from power and influence all who opposed their religious principles. Long down into the reign of Elizabeth, according to the testimony of a modern historian, the old faith still numbered a majority of adherents in England. The experiment would have been hazardous at any time from Henry VIII. to the Spanish invasion if a plebiscite could have been impartially taken of the religious sentiments of the people. This rooted attachment to the old faith and the difficulty everywhere experienced by the Government and the bishops in weaning the clergy and their flocks from their ancient tendencies, is a sufficient proof that it was not unpopular."¹

"I think," says Bishop Stubbs, "that after what I have said, you will allow me to say that I have grounds for believing that Henry VIII. was the master, and in no sense the minister, of his people; that where he carried their good (?) will with him, it was by forcing, not by anticipating or even educating it. I am obliged altogether to reject the notion that he was the interpreter in any

¹ Brewer, "The Reign of Henry VIII.," vol. ii., p. 469.

sense of the wishes of his people; the utmost that he did in this direction was to manipulate and utilize their prejudices to his own purposes."¹ At the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign, after Henry VIII. had used both force and money to wean his nobles and people from their allegiance to Rome, after the Protector Somerset and the other statesmen of Edward VI. had striven by hook or crook to make England Protestant, after Mary's short and in many respects unfortunate reign, "in number the laity, who preferred the mass to the prayer-book, and perhaps the Pope to the Queen as a spiritual head, have been reckoned at nearly two-thirds of the whole population."²

In Germany, the birth-place of the "Reformation," Luther's innovations were by no means received by the people with universal acclaim. Luther himself was fully aware of this. He did not abolish the Mass at once: not even in the electorate of Saxony, where he was permitted by the Elector to wield almost unbounded power in religious affairs. He bade the preachers omit the words in the Canon and Collect that implied a sacrifice. "But the priest may omit this readily, without its being noticed by the common people, and without giving scandal."³ So Luther in 1526. "During a visitation held in the districts of Borma and Tenneberg in January, 1526, by order of the Elector of Saxony, it became apparent how Lutheranism, at that time, had made far from general progress. In Tenneberg, which included twelve parishes, not a single clergyman preached 'the Gospel,' *i.e.*, Luther's doctrine. Only an odd parish desired a change in the sense of the Reformers."⁴ In 1528 Melanchthon made an official visitation of Thüringen. He found the people attached neither to the new doctrine nor to its preachers. "We see," he wrote in 1528, "how the people hate us."⁵ In 1530 things had not improved. Luther's father lay critically ill at Mansfeld; the son was anxious, consoled his father, but dared not visit him, fearing the people might kill him. "I am exceedingly anxious," he wrote to his father, "to come to see you in person; but my good friends have advised against it and dissuaded me, and I, myself, was forced to think that I must not risk danger and tempt God, for you know how lords and peasants love me." The people were still so devoted to the old Church that Luther maintained: "Were I willing, I am easily

¹ W. Stubbs, "On the Study of Mediæval and Modern History," p. 289.

² T. G. Lows in the *English Historical Review*, vol. i., p. 514.

³ Luther, *Sämtliche Werke*, vol. 28, p. 304-5, quoted by Janssen, *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes*, iii., p. 62.

⁴ Janssen, *l. c.* iii., p. 56.

⁵ Janssen, *l. c.*, p. 64.

confident that I could, by two or three sermons, preach back my people into popery and establish new pilgrimages and masses." "I know for certain that here in Wittenberg there are hardly ten that I could not mislead, were I willing to practise again such holiness as I practised in popery, when I was a monk."¹ Even in 1535 Luther and "the Saxon theologians would not concede the demand of the Zwinglian preachers to do away with the Elevation, the Mass vestments and the altar candles, because they feared thereby to call forth excitement among the people."² About the religious feeling in Brunswick two official Lutheran visitors wrote to Bugenhagen in 1543: "In all churches and country parishes, though lying near each other, each one wishes to teach and administer the sacrament after his own head and fashion. Many parsons complain that the people will not go to the Lord's supper, nay condemn sermons and sacraments, and say publicly: the parsons are not at one about the Gospel, why should we heed them? I will hold to my old faith."³ "The greatest part of the people," said Court-preacher Hieronymus Rauscher of Amberg in 1552, "in deep sorrow, turns its eyes to Godless popery, foams and gabbles at all times: 'Since the new doctrine began its course, there has been no luck and happiness in the world: people grow worse, not better, in consequence of evangelical preaching.' Even a generation later Preacher George Steinhart, at Ottersdorf, heard people say: "Ah! Away with this doctrine! Under the Pope's rule things went well, those were good times, and we had all things in plenty; but since the Gospel sprang up, leaves and grass, luck, rain, and blessings have disappeared."⁴ In the Netherlands things looked very ill for the "Godly" undertaking of the house of Nassau; every effort was made to Calvinize the Provinces, but met with little success. "Of the general states and the noblest of the land," wrote Count John (of Nassau), on March 13th, 1578, to Count William of Hesse. "no one has hitherto publicly declared for 'religion,' nor seriously worked for it; of the people only now and then the poor common man."⁵

In England, Germany, Holland, we see, there was no violent hunger after the "new gospel," and yet these three countries were the birthplace, the home and the hot-bed of the "Reformers," "Where Protestantism was an idea only," says Bishop Stubbs, "as in Spain and Italy, it was crushed out by the Inquisition; where, in conjunction with political power and sustained by ecclesiastical

¹ Quoted in Janssen, *l. c.* iii., p. 188.

³ Janssen, *l. c.* iii., pp. 494-5.

⁵ Janssen, *l. c.* v., p. 5.

² Janssen, *l. c.* iii., p. 355.

⁴ Janssen, *l. c.* iii., p. 702.

confiscation, it became a physical force, there it was lasting. It is not a pleasant view to take of the doctrinal changes, to see that where the movement toward it was pure and unworldly, it failed; where it was seconded by territorial greed and political animosity, it succeeded."¹

How unfounded was Luther's assertion that before his day little preaching was done, we have shown in the article on the "Myths of the Middle Ages," published in the October number of the *AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY*, last year (p. 604). The lack of preaching could not have caused the "Reformation" and its spread. Indeed, it is far from true that, even at the beginning of the "Reformation" there was everywhere more preaching of the new faith than there had been of the old. In Germany and Holland, no doubt, there was no lack of preachers damning the Pope and the Papists up and down, and the Protestant dissidents down and up; if damning up and down was preaching the new faith, the new faith was abundantly preached. In England, however, "what contrasts strangely with the reforming movement in Germany," says the *Saturday Review*, "so far from any pains being taken to present the new doctrine to the people, the pulpit stood silent, *partly by order*, as well as from lack of preachers. The Council ordered the bishops to prevent a thing so inconsistent as the preaching of itinerant ministers, and even the licensed preachers, of whom there were very few, were forbidden to discourse except on certain fixed days. Bucer complained that there were parishes where no sermon had been preached for years. Whether from distrust of the clergy, or from a desire to keep the mass of the people in ignorance of the real nature of the religious innovations being forced upon them with a high hand till all was over, preaching was in every way discountenanced or suppressed, so that in truth the great destitution of preaching, *which the Reformation produced*, was the main cause of the beginning of English Dissent."²

"But, perhaps," says the same writer, "what will most startle those who have been used to take a rose-colored view, we do not say of the 'Reformation'—that largely depends upon religious convictions—but of the English 'Reformers,' is the evidence here produced of the unscrupulous tyranny and obscurantism of their whole method of procedure. . . . What is curious, and will to many readers be a surprise, is that every means was taken by those in authority, as though of deliberate intent, to discourage learning

¹ Bp. Stubbs, "Lectures on Mediæval and Modern History," p. 233.

² *Saturday Review*, July 3d, 1886, p. 22, in an article on Rev. R. W. Dixon's "History of the Church of England."

and foster ignorance, alike in the higher classes and among the masses of the people. Thus, to begin with the two universities, a royal commission visited them in 1549, which, under pretence of reforming, went far to destroy them altogether, and Oxford and Cambridge seemed in danger of actually sharing the fate of the monasteries. Ridley, whose name stood on both commissions, attempted some ineffectual resistance, but was easily overborne. . . . Dr. Cox, Chancellor of Oxford, who was on the commission, won with too good reason the unenviable nickname of Cancellor of the University! Under his auspices whole libraries at Oxford were destroyed; 'a cart load of manuscript on theology and the sciences,' from Merton, and 'great heaps of books from Balliol, Queen's, Exeter, and Lincoln' were publicly burnt in the market-place. Meanwhile the choristers and grammar-school boys of the different College schools at both universities were turned out and the schools themselves suppressed."

In Germany, we know of no equally wanton destruction of books and schools. Still the effects of the "Reformation" movement were equally fatal to learning and education. As early as 1526, the Saxon visitors report the almost universal destruction of the parish schools in electoral Saxony.¹ The younger humanists had hailed Luther as a saviour and welcomed his revolt. "Before long," says Paulsen, "the young humanists, who just then so gaily accompanied Luther to the war, and considered Erasmus as a timid old man, were disappointed. As early as 1524 even the dullest had their eyes opened. The universities and schools almost came to nothing amidst the tempests of the religious struggle." It is instructive to look at a few details. "The university of Erfurt was the only one of the German universities which adopted the new doctrine; it was also the first that was undone by it. . . . After 1523 immatriculation stopped altogether; the university almost ceased to exist. . . . In 1524 the Erfurt town-council cut down the salary of the rector of the university, Eobanus Hessus, and in 1526 he went to Nuremberg. He returned in 1533, but the university never regained its strength; after wasting for 300 years it died." At the beginning Melanchthon's Greek lectures at Wittenberg were crowded; in 1524 four attended his lectures on Demosthenes; in 1527 the attendance was less; in that year, however, the plague drove Melanchthon to Jena. Leipzig suffered greatly; Frankfort on the Oder died out entirely between 1520-30, partly because of the religious troubles, partly in consequence of the plague. At Rostock the number of students sank rapidly after 1523; in 1529 not a single matriculation; from 1530-36 the university was practically dead. In a report of 1530 the council of the university

¹ Janssen, *Gesch. des deutschen Volkes*, iii., p. 63.

pronounced the Martinian, *i.e.*, Lutheran faction to be the cause. At Greifswald no matriculants between 1525 and 1539. At Cologne the number of matriculations fell from 3-400 to between 36 and 96 in 1527-43. About 1515 Vienna matriculated 600 per year; in 1530 the whole number of students was 30. The university records, as early as 1522, claim that the cause of the decline is that the Lutheran sect advises against studies and the taking of degrees. At Heidelberg there were more professors than students, whilst at Basel the university was suspended in 1529. In both universities the "Reformation" was charged with their ruin. Ingolstadt, which under the leadership of Eck destroyed every trace of the *virus Lutheranicum*, fared best. The average of the matriculations from 1518-1550 was 136, only 36 less than in the period immediately preceding.¹ "The same decline appeared in the lower schools."²

Dr. Dixon's as well as Paulsen's statements are based on the most careful original research. They show not only what the religious revolution of the sixteenth century did to destroy, but what the Church of the Middle Ages had done to build up, learning. All the universities mentioned, besides others in Italy, France, Poland, had been founded by Catholic princes or cities, and none without the co-operation of the Pope.

That Luther, so to say, rediscovered the Bible, that he first translated it into German, that before him little preaching was done in the vernacular, that the "Reformation" was a popular movement, that it promoted learning and literature,—all these well-worn assertions modern research has pronounced to be myths. There remain a few claims and statements which, while they do not, like the foregoing, assail the Church, are nevertheless interesting. They illustrate Lutheran hero-worship, and show how dangerous it is to accept without careful critical examination many points of Protestant tradition, no matter how often and how confidently repeated. They are legends that grew up not all in Luther's day, but many of them much later, perhaps as late as after the Thirty Years' War. Indeed, in some cases, Luther's own writings refute the claims made for him by his admirers. The first of these legends is the story that Luther closed his speech before the Diet of Worms in 1521 with the memorable words: "Here I stand, I cannot do otherwise." Again and again they have called forth the admiration of Protestant writers; again and again they have been praised as the expression of the Reformer's manly and earnest determination. Like the famous *e pur si muove* of Galileo, however, Luther's heroic expression turns out to be unhistorical. This was

¹ These details are taken from Paulsen, *Gesch. des gelehrten Unterrichts*, p. 138 ff.

² Paulsen, *l. c.*, p. 143.

proved by Burkhardt, a Protestant, in the "Theologische Studien und Kritiken" (1869, p. 517-31).¹ Burkhardt's proposition is confirmed by Balan, who, in his *Monumenta Reformationis Lutheranae*, gives the contemporary report of Luther's speech. It does not contain the famous traditional words.

That Luther invented the new high-German language, is a legend which has been repeated even quite recently over the names of such men as Von Treitschke, Mommsen, Droysen, and Virchow. Luther himself says quite the reverse, and his words are confirmed by the best authorities on the history of the German language, such as the brothers Wilhelm and Jakob Grimm. "In reply to the question, whence Luther took this language" (the German of his Bible and other writings), says Osthoff, "he himself informs us that 'he uses no particular or peculiar language in German,' *i.e.*, no special dialect, but 'the language of the Saxon Chancery,' which is used by all the kings and princes of Germany."² Latin ceased to be used for documentary purposes in the first half of the fourteenth century. For some time thereafter the dialect of each principality was used in its official papers. Under Karl IV. and Wenzel (1347-1400), of the Luxemburg-Bohemian line, the Imperial Chancery used a language based on the German spoken at Prague, but modified; this was gradually adopted in upper and central Germany. In the second half of the fifteenth century the Saxon Chancery gradually discarded the words peculiar to central Germany, and used only such as were common to central and upper Germany. The accession of Frederick the Wise (1485), according to the latest researches, marks the time when the approximation of the language used by the Saxon Chancery to that used by the Imperial Chancery was carried out. "The language, therefore, which Luther introduced into general literary and private use as that of the Saxon Chancery, did not differ from the language of the documents spread by Maximilian I. and his secretaries throughout the Empire. . . . Luther did not create the unity of German speech as if by a single stroke. Only the first firm and lasting foundation thereof was laid by him and the Reformation. For a long time after in low-German countries, low-German was spoken in pulpit, school, and court. The Bible, catechism, and hymn-book were even translated from Luther's text into the several dialects. On Catholic Germany, the larger half of the Empire, the effect of Luther's language as well as of the Reformation itself was slight. And Luther's language, in spite of its universalizing tendency, was still too provincial, nay too individually colored, to be fitted to be

¹ Cited in *Geschichtslügen*, p. 432.

² Osthoff, *Schriftsprache und Volksmundart*, p. 4.

a universal means of communication, to become the natural German written and book language, without further changes."¹

Another flower which Luther's admirers have striven to weave into the legendary chaplet of his fame, is that he was the father of German congregational singing. But one by one the petals have fallen from the flower, and to-day it is uncertain whether more than five or six hymns, and whether a single one of the melodies formerly ascribed to him, can justly and fully be called his. Luther was fond of singing and music, but he himself never claimed to have written and composed all the hymns published in his hymn-book. In the preface to the edition of 1535, he says: "Now follow some sacred songs made by our forefathers (*von den alten gemacht*). These old songs we have taken with us as a testimony of some pious Christians that lived before our time in the great darkness of false doctrine, that it may be seen how there have always been people who rightly knew Christ and by God's grace were miraculously preserved in this knowledge." In the preface to his book of "Christian song, Latin and German, for burial," published in 1542, Luther says: "We have also taken as a good example the fine *musica*, or songs, which were used in popery at vigils, requiems, and burials, had some printed in this book, and in time will take more of them. The song and the notes are beautiful; it were pity, should they perish. As in all other points they (the Catholics) far excel us, have the finest divine service, fine, glorious convents and monasteries. . . . so, too, they have in truth much splendid music or song, especially in the monasteries and parishes." Notwithstanding Luther's own clear words, it became a legend among German Protestants that he first introduced German hymns in the divine service. Many Protestants believe in this legend to the present day; not a few writers continue to repeat it even now. Still, as early as 1784, General Superintendent Bernhart, of Stuttgart, saw the folly of this claim. "How could so busy a man," he says, "have taken up the writing of songs, composition, and notes? A man who held an office at the university, published numerous writings, and was overwhelmed with questions, letters and opinions from all quarters. Luther in his first hymn-book (1524) made only the first hymn, which bears his name. The rest were composed by Sperato and some unknown writers." Schauer, also a Protestant, reduced the number of original hymn-texts written by Luther to six. The others are paraphrases of the Psalms, modifications of old German hymns, and translations from the Latin of such hymns as the *Veni Sancte Spiritus*, the *Te Deum*, etc. Even the most famous of all, "*Eine feste Burg ist unser*

¹ Osthoff, *Schriftsprache und Volksmundart*, pp. 4-7.

Gott," "A tower of strength our God doth stand," is only a paraphrase of the 46th Psalm.

As a hymn composer, Luther has fared even worse than as a text writer. In the eighteenth century he was regarded as the writer of all the hymn-book melodies; historical investigation gradually despoiled him of air after air, until only three melodies were left to his credit. But now W. Bäumker has shown that there is good reason to doubt his authorship of even these three, and Bäumker is endorsed by some of the best musical authorities in Germany. We shall content ourselves with citing the opinion of the non-Catholic editor of the *Allgemeine Deutsche Musik-Zeitung*, Herr Otto Lessmann: "In addition to Luther's other great qualities, tradition has attributed to him great creative power in music; but after the results of the latest Luther researches, the old legend of Luther's importance as a composer may be referred to the realm of inventions. Positive proof of Luther's authorship of a single choral melody does not exist. Even the most important of the hymns ascribed to Luther, that song so full of strength and splendor, '*Eine feste Burg*' ('A tower of strength our God doth stand'), which is said to have been written and composed by Luther at Coburg, in 1530, can hardly be regarded as his intellectual property—as far as the music goes, if we believe a manuscript note of the Reformer on one of his '*Stimmbücher*.' The author of this melody is probably Luther's friend, Cantor Johann Walther of Torgau. He presented to 'the dear man of God' a manuscript collection of sacred songs, in which exists the first copy of that grand melody. . . . Probably Luther's work as a hymn composer consisted in providing new texts for old Catholic church hymns and fitting some of the melodies to his songs. It is notorious that a series of the hymns ascribed to Luther existed long before the Reformation, as, e.g., the melodies, '*Gott sei gelobet und gebenedeiet*,' '*Komm heiliger Geist*,' '*Herre Gott*,' '*Mitten wir im Leben sind*,' '*Gelobet seist du Jesu Christ*,' and others, which in 'the choral books' of Kuhnau and Gebhard are set down as certainly written by Luther. Some melodies of Luther's hymn-book were borrowed by Luther without a change, in others the alteration from pre-Lutheran Latin hymns can be shown, as, e.g., the melody '*Jesus Christus unser Heiland*' is manifestly taken from an old pilgrimage song, '*In Gottes Namen fahren wir*,' which occurs in Oleari's third Hymn-Book of 1525, and as late as 1610 in a collection of old Catholic hymns published at Cologne. The melody, '*Der du bist drei in Einigkeit*,' is an old song, '*O lux beata Trinitas*' and the two melodies '*Christum wir sollen loben schon*,' and, '*Komme Gott Schöpfer, heiliger Geist*,' are adaptations of the Latin hymns, '*A solis ortus cardine*' and '*Veni Sancte*

Spiritus.' The hymns '*Nun komm der Heiden Heiland*,' and '*Herr Gott, dich loben wir*,' may easily be traced back to the hymns, '*Veni Redemptor gentium*' and '*Te Deum laudamus*.'"¹

Thus has historical research dealt with the legends of Luther and the Reformation. In the face of these results it was natural that even men born and trained in the Protestant faith should doubt the benefits and necessity of Luther's schism. "Could not the Church have been reformed from within?" asks Prof. Paulsen. "The attempts in the fifteenth century to reform the clergy and the monasteries had not been as unsuccessful as is often asserted. Might not the abuses in church government and worship (*Kultus*) have been put down without breaking up the unity of the Church? The use of spiritual powers for secular purposes, probably the worst among all the evils of the Church, depended perhaps not so much on the nature of the institution as on certain transient political conditions. . . . It would be foolish, also, to maintain that without Luther's intervention things would have remained as they were. Humanism would have continued its action; 'barbarism' would have been banished by 'culture,' and 'culture' would not have been the result. The historico-philological and mathematico-physical investigations started by humanism would have gone on and produced their results. The Church would have cherished in her bosom the new sciences as she had cherished the old, and all the wretched struggle against science, in which the Church has wasted her strength, would not have taken place. The peace which existed between the hierarchy and science up to the outbreak of the Church revolution would have continued, and the historical development of man would have gone forward more easily and more gradually."²

What inference must be drawn from our study of the results of modern historical science? That the Church and the Papacy have reason to fear true scientific and impartial historical criticism and research? that their safety lies in darkness and concealment? On the contrary, our study leads us to infer that Leo XIII. knew thoroughly what he was saying when he maintained that history is "one of the arms most fit to defend the Church." Already modern historical science has tracked and run down many errors and fables; already it has confuted many slanders and scattered much prejudice; already it has surrounded the Church with a halo of glory to which even non-Catholics cannot close their eyes. History, profane and ecclesiastical, as we have said above, does not directly attack or defend the essentials or main sup-

¹ Allg.; Deutsche Musik-Zeitung, November 9th, 1883,—Luther und die Musik—for the fourth centenary of Luther by Otto Lessmann, quoted in *Geschichtslügen*, p. 353.

² Paulsen, *Geschichte des gelehrten Unterrichts*, p. 132.

ports of the Church; these are in the hands of theology. But history has great power to open men's eyes and to dispel their prejudices. Review the roll of eminent historians that have been led back to the Church by their studies. Ekkard, Voigt, Hurter, Gfrörer, Onno Klopp, Schlosser, Bowden, the Stevensons, occur to our memory without effort. Bear in mind the powerful impression produced by Janssen's "History of the German People," the many conversions reported to have been wrought by it. Nor need we wonder at these effects. The hate of Rome and the Church has always been as much the product of political defamation as of religious invective, of politics as of bigotry. Read the history of Henry VIII. and his minister, Cromwell, of Elizabeth, of Philip of Hesse, of Maurice of Saxony. Do they impress us as religious zealots, or as astute ambitious politicians? Read the history of the Thirty Years' War; are Wallenstein, Richelieu, Mansfeld, Gustavus Adolphus, Oxenstierna, types of self-denying apostles, disinterested missionaries, or even of religious enthusiasts? Give us rather Amru and Omar; their deeds have at least a ring of honest, if brutal, fanaticism; but the heroes of the Thirty Years, the Wallensteins and the Mansfelds, will impose on no one who does not wish to be deceived. And yet perhaps nothing has created deeper religious hate in Germany than this dreadful war. Before the Thirty Years' War, Canisius and his Jesuit brethren brought whole towns and districts back to the old faith; before the war, as we have seen, though sixty years after Luther's revolt, the people sighed for the good old faith and the good old times; after that deadly struggle there is nothing but bitterness and hate. Again in England, before the great Spanish Armada, two-thirds of all England were still Catholic; afterwards there remain only scattered remnants in a few counties. Now, therefore, that historians are gradually feeling the dignity and lofty mission of their science, and see that it is one thing to be a religious or national pamphleteer, another to be a true votary of Clio, the much abused Church of Rome, as the results hitherto obtained show, will reap the benefits of the change. True, it will take years for the truth revealed by scholars to percolate down to the masses or even to the ordinary teachers of the masses. Many a pulpit will hereafter reverberate with threshed out lies; many a godly but ignorant journal will continue to diffuse long refuted error. But even now better informed journals, more carefully compiled school-books, blush to sully their pages with all the antiquated trash; they do honor to the truth; they teach their readers how their fathers and grandfathers were fooled and gulled in many particulars. Even this partial acknowledgment of the truth, this partial rejection of oft repeated historical falsehoods, will teach their readers not to

take on trust every silly statement, every outrageous attack on Rome and "Romanism."

In face of results so useful, so favorable to the Church, historical science has a double claim on the attention and the respect of Catholics. They should love and cultivate it, because, as the Holy Father says, it is a witness to the truth and because it is a means most fit to defend the Church. Much, very much, remains to be done in this field. Most of the work that has relieved the Church of her odium, and awarded to her the credit that is justly her due, has been done by non-Catholics. Much of it can be found only in learned periodicals or voluminous publications, unfit for general reading. If we look into the historical reading available to the English reading Catholic, the demand, we find, is far greater than the supply. Lingard's great work is the one historical classic of which we may be proud. More than fifty years have passed since it was written; still, only a few years ago a non-Catholic firm found it profitable to publish a new edition of this ten-volume work, finer and more attractive than any previous edition. How eloquent a testimony to its worth! Brilliant writers like Macaulay and Froude have been found wanting; but Lingard enjoys the respect of Catholic and Protestant. On Church history we have the translations of Darras, of Alzog, and of Brueck, and they have supplied a crying want. But where is the English reading Catholic to go for the history of France, Germany, and Italy, the great continental European peoples whose history is the marrow of modern European history, the peoples whose history has been especially made the weapon of attack against the Papacy and the Church? There is hardly a comprehensive non-Catholic English history of these nations, nothing but monographs and fragments. Catholic works, deserving the name of history, are wholly lacking. It is precisely this condition of things that protects and prolongs the life of many an effete slander. Here, then, is a glorious field for Catholic scholars. Let them master the last results of recent research, let them analyze them carefully, let them, as the Holy Father says, dread to state an untruth, let them not fear to state the truth, and they will do yeoman's service to the Church and to their countrymen. They will have great advantages. In studying the history of pre-"Reformation" times, they will look at them, so to say, from within. A great effort must be made by the most honest non-Catholic to appreciate justly those times and their spirit; he is as far removed from them as England is from China. The Catholic, on the other hand, is much nearer to the Middle Ages, nearer, that is to say, to their religious and moral spirit. And after all, on the morality and the religion of a nation or an age, must its history chiefly hinge. Art has its glories,

learning its fame, science its grandeur; but art, and science, and learning without morality and religion cannot secure the prosperity of nations, nor stay their downfall. So the Catholic historian has a great advantage in dealing with pre-"Reformation" times, and this is often silently acknowledged by non-Catholic scholars. Let Catholic scholars, then, profit by these advantages. Let them fill up the gaps in English historical literature. Let them work in the spirit of Leo XIII., guided by the love of truth; filled with charity and moderation, let them state facts with vigor, but without venom. If they will thus set forth historic truth, they will reap the respect of all truth-lovers, Catholic and non-Catholic; they will overturn many prejudices against the Church that are already tottering, and will contribute most effectively to defend the Church.

So much for Catholic historical scholars. The layman, on his side, once he realizes the importance of history, once he clearly sees how much it can do to promote the cause of truth and religion, and to place the Church in her proper light before his non-Catholic fellow-citizens, will not fail in his duty. He will himself, no doubt, become an earnest reader of history, and will strive to interest his children in this attractive and useful, we may almost say necessary, branch of learning. He will aid and encourage historical workers, not only with his purse, but, what is more important, with his appreciation. He will help them to rescue from oblivion the noble deeds of unsung heroes and patriots and the past glories of the Church. He will learn again and again the lesson that cannot be too often taught, that all true greatness, whether in Church or State, must have its foundation in morality and religion. In fine, he will find in history new reasons to cherish and admire his Mother Church, that has done so much for mankind.

THE TENDENCY OF ENGLISH JOURNALISM.

THE English press has supplanted the Church of England in the office of final arbiter of Christian truths. The usurpation commenced about fifty years ago. Before that time it was the clergy, individually, who taught themselves and their flocks what to believe. The flocks usually reciprocated the compliment; indeed, the flocks taught as much as did the clergy; still, the system worked harmoniously in the sense that the mutual authority was at once nationally approved and put in practice. Then, as the power of the press began to grow, the mutual authority took the newspapers into partnership; so that clergy, laity and newspapers became the combined teaching-body which dictated what English Christians ought to believe. At first, it was the "religious newspapers" alone which interfered in the domain of dogmatic truth; the editors of these newspapers imagining themselves to be apostles; each one an apostle to his own party. But very soon the secular press came to discover that there was an immense deal to be made out of religion; that a judicious admixture of theological leading articles with political or painfully mundane grooves of advocacy would be sure to increase a paper's circulation by paying court to a new circle of subscribers. Thus the *Times*, forty-five years ago, apprehending that the new "Puseyism" was likely to catch the national religious taste, set to work to write up the Oxford School and to advocate High Church doctrines and ritual. For many months the *Times* confessed itself Puseyite. Then came a mysterious silence on the subject. The *Times*-feelers of the national pulse, gradually perceiving that the Protestant prejudice was in the ascendant over what was called the æsthetic craze, after a discreet interval of a few weeks, veered right around to the opposite side and boldly censured what they had so recently written up. The lesser journals took their cue from the great one. Just as to-day most of the newspapers are anti-Irish, because the *Times*, the leading journal, has set the fashion, so in those days most of the newspapers returned to Protestantism directly the great Jupiter had veered around. Still, all the papers continued to be Christian, though they turned their backs on the "new-fangled Popery." For twenty years there was no apology for freethinking. No morning, evening, weekly or monthly organ ever ventured to plead the cause of infidelity. Up to about the year 1885 there was little more than a feeling the way in such

speculations as *might* possibly lead to dangerous doubts, yet were only hazarded as the legitimate searchings after truth.

And now comes the curious fact that it was not until the country had declined to be wooed by the new Ritualism, and had at the same time given manifest indications that it would not return to the Catholic Church, that English journalism began to play fast and loose with the new freethinking, and to publish extracts from the writings of clever skeptics. Here we reach a "moral" which should be instructive to those Englishmen who pin their faith on their *ecclesia docens*, the press. It used to be urged, fifty years ago, that a "free-press" and the "whole truth" would be necessarily sympathetic experiences; that a newspaper, if untrammelled, would be sure to be first honest, then broadly comprehensive of "both sides." Protestants did not realize that a newspaper, like a shopkeeper, has to "dress the window" so as to attract the most customers; so that if "the circulation goes down" another line must be taken, another style of literary wares must be offered. What would be obvious to any commercial man of the world was never suspected by the ardent votaries of a free press. They took it for granted that the religious advocacy must be sincere; that there could not possibly be intentional *suppressio veri*; that the editor and his staff would have but one object in life, to enlighten their readers on all aspects of all truths. The exact opposite of this surmise would have been nearer the fact. The religious newspapers (we are speaking principally of the "Church organs") were simply combatants who sought to strike down their adversaries without one thought of charity or of truth-loving. To publish everything that could possibly injure an opponent, and to suppress everything that could possibly serve his cause, were the lofty maxims of the apostles at their desks. For some forty years has one Church-newspaper, *The Rock*, adopted this eminently Christian rule of life. Few issues have been without their Roman Catholic scandal, few without their travesty of Catholic truths. And the High Church organs are conducted on the same principles. The grand object being to prove the superiority of Anglican heresies, this is best done by misrepresenting Catholic truths. Here, then, we have one blessing of a "free" press. Here we have the development of that odd substitute for the Divine Church, the printed sheets of party acrimony and commercial greed. In secular newspapers such a development was a matter of course. But in religious newspapers, supposed to teach the whole of the truth, the grooved falsehoods might almost shock even the proprietors.

It would be hard to say whether the secular or the religious newspapers write the more infallibly about religion. Perhaps

there is an airy assumption about the secular organs which is the more captivating because it is so easy. The secular organs, not being hampered by responsibility (they only set up to be critics, not to be teachers), are more sublimely impartial, more disdainful of doctrinal differences, than the grooved apostles of this heresy or of that. Thus the *Daily Telegraph*, when greeting Mr. Herbert Spencer as an advocate for the doing away with Christianity, called attention to the "remarkable passages" in his arraignment, and then passed on to write about the theatres. As a secular newspaper, the *Daily Telegraph* would plead its innocence in merely quoting a score of lines from an infidel writer; the incidental circumstance that a quarter of a million readers would be told that the quoted passages were "remarkable" being perhaps unfortunate but journalistic. This is the way in which the secular newspapers do the harm, by calling attention to what would otherwise pass unheeded. The masses do not read Mr. Herbert Spencer; so the daily newswriters, being aware that his blatant infidelity is the only part of his philosophy they would understand, serve it up on a separate dish for the incitement of their palates, because its pungency will act like condiments to their morals. Fifty years ago no newspaper would have quoted such passages, still less would they have been referred to as remarkable. But this is one of the tendencies of English journalism—to sow broadcast the most poisonous tares of mental evil, utterly reckless of the harm done to the multitude. Now, the religious newspapers go on a very different tack. They abhor infidelity, and sincerely; but they perhaps abhor the Catholic Church quite as much; so they, too, publish as "remarkable" every scandal they can get hold of, which can be made to tell against the Catholic religion; while they commonly decline to publish its contradiction, still more to express regret for giving scandal. After all, there is little to choose between the two. But where the religious newspapers have the advantage of their secular rivals is in their assumption that because they *do* teach, they *can* teach. It is a curious dream of the Protestant mind—it has always been so, it must necessarily be so—that because some one must teach and no one knows who is the teacher, therefore everyone can teach who does teach. The religious newspapers, each and all, adopt this postulate. Each one claims that it can teach, for the simple reason that it does teach, though it will not allow that its opposing newspapers can teach at all. And the readers, like the writers, have their postulate. They take it for granted that because *they* approve the teaching of the particular organ for which they are content to pay their sixpence, therefore that particular organ can teach the truth; the teacher being created orthodox by the taught; graduating as infallible by

the "nobis examinadoribus satisfecit" which is given by admiring readers to their own organ. This may seem comic, but it is true. There are many thousands of English Protestants, devoted members of the Established Church, who would never permit an Anglican newspaper, albeit read by bishops, to lie upon their table or to pass their doors until they had sat in judgment on its teaching on every doctrine; had given it their pontifical sanction and approval; and so, "permissu superiorum," had suffered it to go forth to the world with the unsurpassable authority of (their) Holy See.

Let it be asked, then: What is the tendency of religious journalism so far as belief or unbelief may be prospered? There are three distinct grooves of religious journals: (1) the High Church Anglican, whether Ritualist or Moderate; (2) the Low Church Anglican, whether middle class or rabid; (3) the Dissenting, whether Sectarian or Independent—though these last, somewhat curiously, are not numerous. Now the tendency of Ritualist journalists is to abstractions. They write exclusively of purely visionary theories. They preach the necessity of authority, but abuse their bishops. They urge the duty of obedience, but scold their teachers. They proclaim themselves the ardent apostles of Catholic unity, but vilify the Catholic Church—when it disagrees with them. Four out of five High Church newspapers take this line. The old-fashioned and highly respectable *Guardian* is alone content to preach serenity and acquiescence. This organ represents "the Church of England;" not the flights and the ecstasies of the "Anglo-Catholics," nor the Puritanism *plus* the cant of the Low Church party, but the steady Churchmanship which has been the backbone of the Establishment since the days, say, of Archbishop Laud. The tendency of the *Guardian*, therefore, is to "let alone." "Quieta non movere" is its motto. Probably it is the only Church of England paper which is really practical, or which does not seek to ruin the Establishment by dividing it.

The Low Church organs are mere scandal-mongers. Their reason of being is to abuse "Popery." Their theology is sentiment, their controversy is bitterness, and their Protestantism is fib-telling about Catholics. Their tendency is to bathos or imbecility. Nor have they any strong party which they can serve. The old Evangelical party is dead and gone. It did immense good in its day by preserving the sentiment of Christianity, and with the sentiment a vast amount of practical piety. All that is left now of this really earnest party is its Puritanism without its intensity, its combativeness without its quiet faith. The tendency, therefore, of the Low Church organs is to a feminine sentimentality without backbone of creed or of much educatedness. The Ritualists have deprived Low Churchism of its historic foundation by showing up the

"Reformation" as a fraud. The Broad Churchmen have fairly driven it out of the field by expanding their own theology so as to include it. The scientific men have laughed it to scorn as a mere indulgence of feelings and emotions. As a school, it has no place among the working powers. Many so-called Evangelicals are admirable Christians; but this is from the traditions which cling to them as well as from a simple ignorance of Catholic truths. Their organs, seeming to know that their day is past, can only go on hammering away against Popery.

It would not be easy for an outsider to "class" the periodicals which are announced as being the organs of the sects. Thus, why twelve of them should be called the "twelve non-sectarian papers," or why one in particular should be entitled "Nonconformity;" why the Primitive Methodists should have only one organ, while the Wesleyans enjoy the privilege of two; or why the Baptists should require two organs to express their views, seeing that they differ so little from the Methodists; or why the Society of Friends should need two organs—unless it be for the advertisement of their good works—are all riddles which an outsider cannot guess, and which, probably, "proprietors" alone can fully solve. Some of these papers are well toned; they are amiable, philanthropic, and *not* sectarian; they are only accidentally of narrow compass, their spirit being generous and sympathetic. Dissent, being a plant of English growth, is at home in the little province of its enterprise. Not one dissenter in a hundred bears malice towards the sects which, for some caprice, are differently named to his own. Dissent is more magnanimous than is Low Churchism; certainly more so than is Ritualism or High Churchism. Nor are its organs, as a rule, nearly so bitter; though, in Scotland, the Presbyterians (who would be shocked if we called them dissenters) are normally bitter against Catholics and against Episcopalians.

But if it be asked, is the general tendency of religious journalism towards union with or separation from the Catholic Church? the answer is that the majority of the journalists are anxious that the Catholic Church should submit to *them*, but that they have not the remotest idea of submitting to the Catholic Church.

Indeed, there is no more desire for Catholic unity indicated by writers for the religious journals than there is by the writers for the secular journals. A glance at the five hundred and eighty-three daily papers of the United Kingdom, were any one disposed to run them through, would probably disclose a common indifference to every form of schism or heresy, such as might best be expressed by the word "Liberal." Religious Liberalism, with the journalists, means indifferentism. It sounds much better to say that you are tolerant of others' views than that you are without

any fixed views of your own ; yet the word Liberal means in religion, "it does not matter ;" and this is the religious Liberalism of English newspapers. The secular journals affect a superb magnanimity when they plead for "equality of rights all round ;" putting themselves in an attitude of superiority to all contentions, as though their minds were too colossal to stoop to details. Indeed, there is no subject on which the journalists are so didactic as in exhorting to the supreme duty of profound indifference. Were it possible that, in their superiority, they could grow angry, they would lash the wicked men who believe in religious dogma,—on the necessity of having a creed and of sticking to it,—with a severity that would be simply awful for them to read, and which would make them feel themselves to be criminals of deepest dye. They can forgive almost every fault except dogmatism. We all know that the unpardonable sin of the Catholic Church is in teaching that there can be only one Christianity ; but the unpardonable sin of Protestants—in the estimation of their journalists—is in the not admitting that all religions are equally good. Now, the journalists are so superior to common people that there is no fear of their tumbling (in type) into this sin. They might do it in private life ; but professionally they are impeccable, so far as to never appear to believe in anything. They write of Christianity in the abstract as a most respectable and time-honored tradition ; which, though possibly it may be only a beautiful superstition, is entitled to historic credit as an old friend. When, however, Protestants affirm that there must be dogma, the journalists say, "No, here you exceed your liberties. We permit you to believe in the fact of a redemption ; but when you insist on Christian dogma we must rebuke you ; for this is to be illiberal, and, therefore, wicked." Religious Liberalism—supposing it were possible to define it—is the right of not believing what any authority declares to be true ; and this on the ground that no authority can exist, save only by the individual approval. (We are speaking, of course, solely of Christian authority.) So that the journalists, after all, are consistent in their measure when they preach against the insisting on dogma, since dogma without authority would no more be possible than would obedience without somebody to command. But the journalists go a big step further than this ; for they preach that there *ought not* to be authority ; that it is a positive blessing to be without the necessity of believing anything ; that the joy of life is in the intellectual rambling through the possibles, with no goal but the possible arriving at the slightly probable. This postulate being granted, religious liberalism can have no difficulty in passing on to formulate certain principles ; and these are : (1) nobody knows anything for certain ; (2) therefore, common sense teaches respect

for religious ignorance. And so the journalists might define their religious liberalism in this way: "a quiet contempt for one's own convictions, because one must have a quiet contempt for other people's;" the corollary being "a quiet respect for the quiet contempt with which everybody must regard our convictions and their own." Now, when we return from this digression to the inquiry which we made just now, "Is the general tendency of religious journalism towards union with, or separation from, the Catholic Church?" we see at once that all union is out of the question where there is nothing certain about which two people can be united. And so, as a matter of fact, our five hundred and sixty-three daily papers seldom speak of the reunion of Christendom save as they would speak of the pleasant amenities of a social party; of that harmony of good breeding and good fellowship which makes life so much more agreeable, and perhaps more virtuous. A union on all points of the Christian faith is not desired, because it presupposes authority; and authority, in matters of faith, is thought to be as little desirable as, in matters of the State or household, it is thought requisite. Here, then, we have a direct tendency to continued schism. English journalism gives no sign of desiring to heal English divisions, because it treats those very divisions as not discreditable.

Is there any connection between the secular teaching of English journals and the religious ideas or impressions of English people; or does the tone or spirit of secular teaching at all affect, indirectly, the prospects of religion throughout the country? If we assume that there are four grooves in chief in popular journalism,—the political, the social, the literary, and the religious,—can these grooves at all react on one another? Undoubtedly they do. Politics affect religion in its action, in the enjoyment or the restriction of its liberties. At the present moment in England the only point where politics come into actual collision with religion is in the School Board principle of excluding religious teaching from the daily life and schooling of young people. It is not necessary here to say more on this point than that the Catholic hierarchy are contending bravely against such paganism. Some of the journals are following the counsel of Cardinal Manning, and are being taught by him what is true Liberalism, what is false.

But to speak, next, of the social groove: Can its treatment by the journalists at all affect the national religious creed? Only, of course, in the degree of the respect which it shows to what are called ethical principles. Now, here we may be reminded that the institution, "society journals," must have a tendency to enfeeble social ethics. At least, many Catholic writers have seemed to think so. Perhaps, however, this is an exaggerated estimate. It may be hazarded

that their influence is superficial. Since they spring only out of the lightest vanities of the social life, they minister only to that feeble class of persons who take delight in fashionable small-talk or in scandals. Besides, at least, they make people timorous of being "pilloried," and so exercise a certain salutary restraint. They are rather weak, perhaps, than vicious in their object. They simply proceed on the principle that, of the three levers which move society—popularly said to be vanity, love, interest—the most money is to be made out of appeals to vanity. That they are shamelessly personal is, at once, their greatest fault and their most powerful attraction to their readers. Indeed, the breadth of their personalities is their real offence. It is quite a new offence in "respectable" journalism. Twenty years ago a "fashionable column" in the *Morning Post* was all the pabulum which Vanity Fair could find to feed upon. Now, we have hundreds of columns every week, in some couple of dozen so-called society papers, which are intended to inform "the people" of what the "upper ten thousand" do, and to introduce them (in print only) to their drawing-rooms. Yet the tendency of such journalism is rather to excite curiosity than to do harm by lifting the veil from private lives. Bad taste, bad form, would be the severest imputation which such very morbid journalism could be said to merit. In the very fact that they tell us that they intend to be personal—that they exist only to gossip of persons who are "in society,"—we are forewarned of the thin ice they are about to tread upon; and we know that actions for libel dog their steps. So that the danger is, perhaps, more to themselves than to their readers. Besides, they cannot be said to be more personal than are the newspapers. And, unquestionably, there is more harm done by personal writing in the newspapers than there is by personal writing in the "society papers." In the newspapers we are not forewarned of the professed purpose. We take up a morning paper, and find that a man's honesty has been grossly assailed in a leading article; and this, too, on the sole ground that his politics happen to be unpalatable to the editor (or the proprietor) of the "organ." (We must speak of this scandal in connection with social ethics, because it is common to most classes of English papers.) Thus, Mr. Gladstone is spoken of by a Tory journal as a man who is "too obviously without even a shred of sincerity in his character." The Irish members of Parliament are dismissed by a titled Tory as "men who accept money to ruin their country." Mr. Parnell is accused of writing shameless letters—of which the origin is astutely hid by the *Times* newspaper—and the Tory party acquiesce in this facile method of throwing mud, without inquiring even "what is the authority?" In some of the religious papers per-

sonalities are equally common. A Protestant bishop is spoken of by a Ritualist journal as "a mere Dissenter who likes to stick to the loaves and fishes;" while converts to the Catholic Church have been pronounced by one censor as "men of weak intellect or weaker character." Thus personalities are used as perfectly legitimate weapons, even to the extent of trying to ruin men's characters. It is true that nothing so disgraceful as the libels on Mr. Parnell has been known in the "respectable" journalism of the last fifty years; but the *spirit* of the attack is common to most newspapers, which hope to prosper their tactics by personalities. Now, this tendency is growing in force from year to year. It would be platitude to speak of its vileness or its meanness.

Let us refer to another tendency, equally contemptible with personalities, and born of the same malice of partisanship. The suppression of truth, with the false "reporting" of opponents, is quite a recognized institution in party journalism. (We find this vice rampant in all the four grooves of journalism—the political, the social, the literary, and the religious.) One or two ordinary examples may be given. Thus, if a Home Ruler makes a speech, it is cut short by hostile journals so as to thin its force or make it quite pointless. If a thousand facts in Ireland all tend in one direction, but one fact seems to tend in another, then the thousand facts are ignored, but the one fact is made the subject of a highly ethical and didactic leading article. If the Pope issues an Encyclical against heresies, not a word of it is quoted in an English journal; but, if he writes to the Irish bishops to condemn exceptional tactics, there is not a newspaper that does not claim him for its authority. A hundred such examples might be enumerated. Thus, Suppression and Personalities are the two favorite weapons of what are called party-organs in Church and State.

As to literature—which we referred to as a fourth groove in the popular press—new books are reviewed by most journalists in precisely the same spirit of partisanship. Each organ notices the books of its own party, but either ignores or makes light of its opponents'. This is as true of the "Church" organs as of the secular ones. Thus, reviewing is made to indirectly affect religion, by misrepresenting approved authors. Put together, then, the three grooves of the secular journals—the political, the social, and the literary—and it is obvious that, either directly or indirectly, the tendency must be injurious to the fourth groove, which is religion treated only diplomatically.

This whole subject of "party organs" is so difficult, if viewed ethically, that it would need the wisdom of the Holy See to give judgment on it. No one denies that a party organ must be one-sided. It would have no reason of being if it were not so. But,

need a party organ be both unjust and ungenerous? English journalism is now worked on this principle: That to prove his case, at all cost, is the duty of the journalist; *not* to prove what is true, what is just. "We do not want the truth," the writer of a leader seems to say; "what we want is to prove *ourselves* right." Exactly as a counsel in a court of justice says all that can possibly be said for his own side, and all that can possibly be said against the other side; so, a writer of a leading article ignores every consideration but such as may make his view seem the right one. But, in a court of justice, the jury hear both sides. In a newspaper the readers read only one side. And, since nine men out of ten read only their party organs, they never get to know anything of the other side. Here, then, is a tendency which is positively corrupting—to men who have not the strength of mind to read both sides. They who have lived much in the editorial atmosphere—and writers of leading articles have this experience—know that any offence is pardonable save the "stultifying" of a newspaper by making it unsay what it said the day before. If a wagon-load of evidence were to arrive at an editor's door, proving his statements on the previous day to be all fibs, he would simply comment on the wagon-load as "angry protests against our statements, which are obviously biassed by a strong party feeling." *He* has, of course, no party feeling. And behind his back stands the proprietor of the newspaper, who is inquiring about the "increase in the circulation," and who would rather his editor made a hundred slips in grammar than that he should "stultify the paper" by one apology. Papers are published, first, to make money. Editors have to labor, first, to please proprietors. The staff have to write, first, to "preserve the unities of the organ," which, in plain truth, means to shape conscience to diplomacy. The best contributor is he who attracts the most customers. A free press means the *right* of attracting customers. Take away the merchandise out of newspapers, and how much would be left of pure motive?

In these days not one paper in twenty can manage to pay its way without advertisements. But the advertisements depend largely on the circulation, so that, to secure the prop of the paper, the first object of the proprietor must be to secure the popularity of his advocacy. Now, human nature must be supposed to influence even proprietors. It is not every man who will throw away a thousand a year for the lofty pleasure of perfectly satisfying his own conscience. Merchandise is, after all, but a game of chess, in which the pawns, which are called "our principles," are meant to cover the big pieces, which are (speaking proprietorially) the profits. And since a free press was established, the poor pawns have been pushed forward with a splendid pretence of being the important

pieces on the board, while, alas, the bishops and knights, the castles, kings and queens, have been the humble instruments of the "balance" to the proprietors. The few papers which have been edited solely for truth's sake have almost invariably come to grief. Such has been the irony of a "free" press. Nor is it wholly the fault of the proprietors. Readers of newspapers insist on having what they want, and, if they get what they do not want, they write to the manager: "Sir, please cease to send me your paper." So that readers make the papers what they are. The tendency of English journalists is to gross unfairness, because the tendency of English readers is to gross prejudice.

But apart from such general characteristics, which are common, more or less, to all journalism, let it be asked, what are the present tendencies of English newspapers, in the way of advocacy of one extreme or another? Politically, the tendency is to a hard Toryism, out of a fear of the extreme sects of revolutionists. Since Radicalism and Socialism grew rampant, Toryism has grown harder and more cruel. The present spirit of English journals, in regard to Ireland, is an illustration of the reaction to wilful hardness. Not only are all the morning papers save one, and all the evening papers save two, devoted to what is understood by "Balfourism," but even the Sunday papers—supposed to be written for "the people"—are, with one exception, anti-Irish. The "weeklies" are all set in the same direction, with only two conspicuous exceptions. The bitterness of English journalism against the fighters for Irish liberties has had no parallel since the days of "No Popery." Here, then, is a tendency to partisanship which has no redeeming feature of natural kindness, nor the faintest instinct of justice to other peoples. Ignorance may be a good plea for the multitude; but the upper and the middle classes set their teeth against the Irish, wholly forgetful of the awful past of Irish wrongs, and wholly insensible to the natural duty of reparation. The newspapers take this side, with the majority, because their interests, for the moment, seem to suggest it, and because they fear that they will be suspected of Radical leanings if they venture to write honestly about Ireland. English journalism is unjust to the Irish, because it is afraid of English prejudice and susceptibility.

So that, politically, the tendency of English journalism is to resist the waves of democracy by being *more* Tory. This might be all very well if it were not an apparent probability that the "one man one vote" principle will be soon adopted. But it must seem unwise to try to irritate those classes which, before long, will have increased political power, instead of magnanimously and chivalrously doing justice, so as to take the "reason of being" out of revolution. And we may see another example of this stolid Toryism

in the attitude of the press towards the House of Lords. Nothing could be more lamentable, politically, than the obliteration of a "second, revising chamber." Yet all the world recognizes that the legislative unfitness of at least three-quarters of the House of Peers is so manifest that custom alone could let it stand. Now the press will not attack this (known) anomaly, for fear of being suspected of being Radical. The exactly opposite course would be less Radical. For, if now, in times of peace, the Upper House could be reconstituted, there would be no fear of its being pulled down in times of trouble; whereas, should we have our revolution, the House of Lords would "go first," and the Throne would be not unlikely to follow it. Here, then, is another example of the tendency of English journalism to oppose Radicalism by a fictitious warmth of Toryism. Ireland and the House of Lords are two very good examples of this tendency to immobility or stolidity.

As to religion, what has been said might suffice, save that it is desirable to notice more particularly the *interest* which some journalists take in skepticism. A glance at the British magazines, periodicals and reviews, numbering about twelve hundred and twenty, and also at the London weekly or interval papers, numbering about three hundred and ninety, discloses a spirit of interest in skepticism which is much stronger than that of repugnance to unbelief. Some of the scientific papers profess atheism. Most of them look down upon Christian dogma. Some few are emphatic in proclaiming their theism; but the belief is often qualified by "natural religion." There is no scientific paper which affects to connect its science with the profession of belief in the Church of England, perhaps for the simple reason that no scientist, no logician, could connect certain truth with private sentiment. A belief in Christianity is one thing, but a belief in the Church of England is another. All that we find in such scientific papers as profess religion is the assertion that creation manifestly points to a Creator; not, as St. Thomas shows, that the philosophy of Catholicity is in harmony with the whole suggestion of the universe. But what is the general tendency of science papers? Is it towards faith or unbelief? Towards faith, inferentially, yet chiefly towards natural religion. As to the bulk of the interval papers—weekly, monthly, or quarterly—they mostly ignore religion altogether. Nor can we, reasonably, expect that, say, the class periodicals, numbering eight hundred and forty-five, should combine a subject which is outside their province with the interests of exceptional trades. Indeed, it is better that they should leave it alone. They do not pretend, like the "popular" papers, to know everything. Our point is that the daily papers—and not a few of the weeklies—treat religion as they treat politics or sociology, except that their enthusiasm about the latter is not extended to their discussions about the former.

"The number of people who take the trouble to think for themselves is very small indeed," as Mr. Puff says, in Sheridan's comedy of "The Critic"; so the journalists have to take the trouble to think for them, and the operation is commonly performed in this way—at least, on the part of the "religious journals": "I want you," says the editor of such a journal to one of his staff, "to write me an article on Ritualism. Be careful to steer clear of committing the paper to any approval of Ritualist practices; yet, at the same time, do not say a word in discouragement of the party, because a number of our subscribers are Ritualists. You might throw in some platitudes about the hard-working Ritualist clergy, their undeniable zeal, and all that sort of thing; but you had better also express a general regret that they do not more consult their congregations as to the acceptability of new doctrines or practices. You see the line? The fact is, we went a little too far in our somewhat hurriedly-written leader of last week, and I have been deluged with correspondence in consequence. Observe the *juste milieu*. Don't commit us."

And the readers are mostly satisfied with the "admirable prudence and moderate counsel" which the leader of the following week puts before them.

So that we might sum up the whole tendency of English journalism—in its relations to what may be called religious views—as the suggesting to readers that they should suggest to their journalists the sort of teaching they want to have suggested back again. Reciprocity is the amiable idea; but the readers must begin first, or the journalists cannot insist earnestly—with an air of authority—that the readers should believe what they want to believe. Then, when the journalist proceeds to lay down the law, the readers are delighted with his sagacity, not considering that he has been instructed to write what he does write, because it is exactly what the readers want to have. A mutual complimentary society is what is really established by the proprietor, the staff, and the readers. It is a harmonious and a successful arrangement. Still, regarded from a supernatural point of view, it is lacking in some essentials of infallibility.

As to the future, a multiplication of such advocacies is all that we have reason to expect. Meanwhile, Catholic newspapers are on the increase. What is wanted is a Catholic daily paper, and also a Catholic quarterly review. It is certainly high time that English Catholics had a quarterly review of their own. Three years ago a private gentleman tried to start one, but he met with obstacles which tempered his enthusiasm. In the same spirit, ten years ago, a private gentleman tried to start a London Catholic daily paper, but only half of the necessary funds could be guaran-

teed. It is lamentable that political bias is so strong among English Catholics that the Irish question alone fatally divides them. A daily paper, which should advocate Irish liberties, would not be patronized by a large section of English Catholics.

On religion alone would English Catholics be united; and it is just exactly on that one subject that no existing daily paper ever sounds the true note of Catholicity, or even affects to feel so much as scholarly interest.

A NEW BIOGRAPHER OF OUR LORD.

UNDER the enticing title, "The Boyhood of Christ,"¹ appears one of the handsomest and best printed and illustrated books, perhaps, ever seen in this country. Not large in size—it consists only of 101 pages—but magnificently gotten up, and accompanied with thirteen exquisite plates, most of them splendid copies from paintings by the great masters, the book has been intended—so at least it appears—to serve as a holiday present of the most attractive character, and reach, if it were possible, every Christian home, not only in this land, but in every other where the English language is understood or spoken. What Christian mother, in coming across a book of this character, on such a sweet and interesting subject, suggestive of the tenderest as well as most poetical feelings of the heart, and so beautiful and artistic in its external form, would not be at once inclined to give to it a prominent position among the choicest ornaments of her parlor? And what man, or woman, whether single or married, whether advanced in age or still in the prime of life, who admires what is beautiful and feels towards a child, even if that child is not our Divine Lord, that profound reverence, as well as sympathy, which innocence and purity inspire at all times and force themselves into our hearts, could resist the temptation of bringing to his wife, or to a beloved mother, or daughter, or sister, such an interesting and refined present as the book now referred to might apparently constitute?

And then, if it should happen for the looker-on to turn the title page and read the dedication, "To the soul of my mother," who

¹ *The Boyhood of Christ*, by Lew Wallace, author of *Ben Hur* and *The Fair God*, illustrated.

could resist the temptation of taking with him the book and anticipating a noble, elevating and purifying enjoyment?

True it is that at once something in the title page itself might be found capable, if not of chilling the blood of the reader, even if he is not in any way pious, at least of causing him to desire that such a thing would have been omitted. Why did the author of "The Boyhood of Christ" add to his name that he was also the author of "Ben Hur" and "The Fair God"? Did he intend to forewarn that he was a writer of fiction and that "The Boyhood of Christ" was to be written also under the rules pertaining to compositions of that kind, and with no other sentiment than the one inspiring a more or less sensational novel? Could he have forgotten so completely the well-admitted maxim, proclaimed even by heathens, that "holy things must be treated holily,"—*Sancta sancte tractanda*?

Mr. Wallace's heart made him feel the necessity to explain to the public why he had written this book. People would ask, or wonder, he says, why he, who is "neither minister of the Gospel, nor theologian, nor churchman," had "presumed" to give this work to the public. "It pleases him," he says, "to answer respectfully" that he did so "to fix an impression distinctly in his mind." And this impression was that "the Jesus Christ in whom he believes was, in all the stages of his age, a human being," and that "his divinity was the Spirit within him, and the Spirit was God."

Whatever might be said of this reason and of its soundness both theologically and philosophically, it must be taken for granted that for the author at least it is satisfactory. It is not, besides, in any form or manner, the subject of our inquiry.

The plan of the book is certainly calculated to inspire interest. An old man, Uncle Midas, who had seen the world, and been a lawyer and a soldier, an author and a traveller, and had dabbled in art, diplomacy and politics,—exceedingly refined in his manners,—who had visited Turkey and Palestine, and had, after reaching his sixty-fifth year, retired to live with ease and comfort, surrounded by his books and his mementoes, is visited a Christmas eve by some young people, who rather like to hear him talking than abandoning themselves to the pleasures of dancing, and suggest as an appropriate subject of the conference the boyhood of Christ.

Uncle Midas had his library, where the conversation passed, near a greenhouse where he treasured with care a palm tree which the monks of Mar Saabe had given him, a vine which he had brought from a garden near the walls of Jerusalem, and an oak from Mamre. Flowers suggested to him only their transient

glory and beauty. But these mementoes and his books helped him to keep his mind well balanced and contented.

Nan and Puss are two girls, just verging on womanhood, who delight in listening to the old man, and desert the ball-room to come to his study. "We have come to hear you talk," says one of them, with the charming but somewhat abrupt frankness natural to her age. And while the strains of the music occasionally reach the room, as if recalling them, although in vain, to the pleasures which they have foregone for the moment, the subject of the boyhood of Christ is suggested by them.

"It is so hard," says Puss, "to think of our Lord as a boy. I mean to say," she adds, "to think of Him running, jumping, playing marbles, flying kites, spinning tops and going about all day on mischiefs, such as throwing stones and robbing birds' nests."

And to this the old man whom the subject suggested gives pleasure, answers with a grave smile: "Rest, you little friend, if the Nazarene lads of his day had tops, marbles and kites,—I am not sure they had,—I would prefer to believe he found enjoyment in them."

Shortly afterwards a lad, named John, came to join the listeners; and later on some other people, of about the same age, also escaped from the dancing-hall and swelled the attentive audience.

All of this seems, no doubt, exceedingly interesting. An old man, on Christmas eve, talking of the Child Jesus to children who are anxious to know all about the boyhood of the Redeemer, certainly affords a subject for a most charming composition, whether literary or in painting. Purity, sanctity, innocence, beauty in its most sympathetic and charming form, had necessarily to be the canvas or the background upon which Uncle Midas was called to put, as if it were in contact, the Child who was God with the children born of men, who were anxious to know Him. What a great opportunity for the elevation of minds, for the infusion of religious feelings, for promoting attachment to divine things, for rendering the Church and her teachings amiable and interesting!

But, alas, how distant Mr. Wallace has been from attaining these results!

This book, besides being disappointing to the last extreme, is a living and perpetual contradiction of its own purposes and ideas. It was conceived, as the author says, to fix distinctly in his mind that our Lord was, in all the stages of His life, a human being—and when Puss says to Uncle Midas that it is hard for her to think of our Lord as a boy, as if He had been like the other boys, sons of men, he said, as we have seen, that he would prefer to believe

that the Child Jesus found enjoyment in the juvenile amusements and plays of all times and places.

As Puss, astonished, as it seems, by the idea suggested by the old man, exclaimed almost with reproach, "Oh, Uncle Midas!" as meaning, how is it possible that a man of his good sense and judgment could set forth such a strange proposition, Uncle Midas became serious; his "smile vanished," and he answers the girl: "I see that you are going the way of the many; by and by you will not be able to think of our Lord as a man!"

And nevertheless, when all the pages are read, when the talk of Uncle Midas is finished—when the whole story is told—the conclusion which is reached is the absolute and complete denial of the idea that apparently pervades the book, and seemed to be paramount in Uncle Midas's mind. The conclusion is that "Christ had no boyhood at all." The book ends by a request, on the part of Uncle Midas, to be pardoned by his audience for his attempt to convince them; that, in fact, our Lord was never a boy.

And, indeed, such pardon is necessary, not only for the strange inconsistency between the premises and the conclusion based upon them, but for the spirit of disguised, although, perhaps, unintentional, irreverence which shows itself through the narrative.

Uncle Midas speaks of his attachment to Christ because of His human nature. God is so far beyond his comprehension that he gives up in despair. But for Christ, how different his feelings are. He is His friend, His brother; Uncle Midas could have borne to look into His face. He could have even laid his head fearlessly upon His breast. And as he finds it amazing that the "childhood of such a man should be so beggarly of authentic incident," he entertains his audience, and answers to their questions, by reading from a book which he keeps in his library simply as a monument of the capability to believe even absurd things which in his judgment exists in man. This book, which he alleges to be the only one on the subject, though there is another, he says, not worthy to be mentioned, for its extreme inferiority, is the one which he calls "The First Gospel of the Infancy of Jesus Christ," and which he hastens to say that he dislikes because the stories that it tells "detract from the exceeding holiness of the personages of whom they are told," and because they are "trifling and puerile."

But as the children crowded around him are anxious to hear what is said in that book, Uncle Midas selects carefully what he can find in it more readily admitting of stern criticism, and even caricature, and tries to impress upon the minds of his listeners the wrong idea that the pious author of the "Book of the Miracles of our Saviour, and Lord, and Teacher, Jesus Christ, which is called

the Gospel of the Infancy," as the work is really named, represents the Holy Family as seeking for entertainments, being given presents, and our Blessed Lady as a "showwoman of the miraculous powers of her Son," whom "she exhibits in the towns along the way" during her pilgrimage to Egypt.

The circumstance must perhaps be noticed, that in reaching this point, and when, indeed, the real subject of the boyhood of our Lord, with which the book is intended to deal, begins to be discussed, no less than 73 pages out of the 101 which the whole work contains have been already filled with preliminary remarks and a *mise en scène*.

The tales of devils cast out only by the contact with linen belonging to the infant Saviour, which His blessed Mother had washed and hung somewhere to be dried; and the story of the robbers whom the legend says the holy travelers met after they reached Egypt; and that of the idols which fell down with a crash at the simple approach of the Child-God to the magnificent temples where they were worshipped; and that of St. Joseph being a bad carpenter, and that our Lord often came to his assistance, to correct his errors in his measurements, or straighten properly what he had done crookedly or imperfectly, are all picked up and related isolatedly, deprived of the charms of the oriental poetry with which they were adorned, and, more than this, stripped wholly of the pious and reverent spirit with which they were written and have been preserved for centuries, not only in the eastern countries, but everywhere else—Uncle Midas's intention having been, apparently, to draw from his listeners emphatic exclamations of surprise and even of disgust, and, perhaps, scandal, as if something blasphemous, or utterly shocking in some other respect, had been uttered in their presence.

What a great injustice, however, he did to this book, and to the various others which he did not mention, or did not know of, which relate to this subject!

The "Gospel of the Infancy," copies of which in manuscript, in Arabic, and in Syriac, are preserved in the library of the Vatican at Rome and in the National Library at Paris, and which has been printed in the two languages aforesaid, and in most, if not all, the modern languages, was originally believed, by the people among whom it appeared, to have been written by St. Peter, upon material furnished him by the Blessed Virgin. Probably in its present form it was made up by some Nestorian writer; which accounts, among other things, for the great favor that it always enjoyed among the followers of Nestorianism. It was natural that the believers, not only in the two natures of our Lord and Saviour, but in the existence in Him of two persons, distinctly different, one from the other,

would have tried to treasure as many traditions as they could find among the people, which related directly to the childhood of Christ. Its popularity, especially in Egypt, where most of the facts that it narrates took place, has been maintained for centuries perfectly unabated. It has still great credit among the Copts, who possess, in addition to this book, a great number of others, dwelling upon the same subject, one of which is a "History of the Flight into Egypt," falsely attributed to Theophilus of Alexandria.

The works above cited, and the "History of Joseph the Carpenter," the "Protoevangelion of James the Less," the "Gospel of Thomas the Israelite, on the things done by the Lord when still an Infant," the "Gospel of the Nativity of Saint Mary," the "Gospel of the Nativity of Mary, and of the Infancy of the Saviour," and several others, are certainly interesting monuments, which irrefutably testify to the movements of the human mind at a period of history exceedingly worthy of attention. They are not monuments, as Uncle Midas thought, of that kind of imbecile, indiscriminate aptness to believe all things, no matter how absurd, which he ascribes to mankind; but monuments of literature, as well as of pious and religious feeling, wherein the charms of poetry have been lavishly poured down, and wherein the purest intention and good faith had been displayed at all parts.

In these legends of the Evangelic times, always shining with candor and good intention, where traditions dear to the people have been carefully preserved, the soul and life of the Christian society of the day are to be found portrayed. They were destined for the family circle, to be narrated at home, under the tent, at the foot of the palm-trees, where the caravan halted; and a good picture of the popular customs of the primitive Church is preserved by them. They were the popular poems of the first neophytes of the new worship; and faith and imagination vied with each other to render them interesting and beautiful. The Church, in her wisdom, has not admitted them as canonical, but recognized, with reason, that they lack authenticity; but her action has stopped at this point, no doctrine against the faith having been found in them. Their influence, on the other hand, has been extraordinary, because for many centuries they have contributed powerfully and directly to the development of poetry and the fine arts. The epic and dramatic art of the Middle Ages, as well as painting and sculpture, have largely drawn from these legends. Christian art owes to them its origin; and as Balmez has justly remarked, "In whatever manner we may judge of them, and even if we attempt to altogether set them aside as mere illusions, the fact remains that they are harmless, and have contributed immensely to the glories of art, the cultivation of sentiment, and the civilization of the world."

It would have been, no doubt, better for Uncle Midas to entertain his innocent, attentive listeners with stories like the ones still told to the travelers in Egypt, about the miracles and innocent deportment of the Child-God, than to plant into their souls, prematurely, the spirit of doubt and adverse criticism, if not a kind of Puritanic horror of any mild form or expression of human nature.

People who have visited Cairo, or occupied themselves with these subjects, remember a small stream of fresh, delicious water which flows in the vicinity of that city, and is bordered with fragrant balm shrubs. The water elsewhere in that territory is salty and bitter. The shrubs cannot thrive except on the particular spot which the privileged stream can wash. In answer to any questions about the reasons of this striking fact, they will explain to you the same now as many centuries ago, that Mary washed at that spring the clothing of her Divine Son, that the water became then purified and wholesome, and that wherever a drop of it fell upon the ground a balm-tree sprang up at once, fragrant and luxurious.

They will tell you, also, with that richness of imagination that is characteristic of eastern people, why a branch of the palm-tree has been chosen, as if by common consent of the human race, to symbolize triumph or victory. In a fatiguing journey through the desert, a palm-tree having been seen at a distance, Mary suggested to Joseph, "Let us repose a little under its shade"; and Mary, having sat down, cast a glance at the top of the palm-tree, and saw that it was loaded with fruits; and she said to Joseph, "My wish should be, if possible, to have one of those fruits." And then the child, Jesus, who was in the arms of the Virgin Mary, said to the palm-tree: "Tree, bend down thy crown, and give my mother thy fruits." And then, at His voice, the palm-tree inclined its head until it touched the feet of Mary; and Mary collected as much of the fruit as she wanted. . . . And Jesus said (on the following day): "I say to thee, palm-tree, . . . and I grant thee as a blessing, that of all who shall conquer in the battles of faith, it shall be said forever, 'You have obtained the palm of victory.'"—(History of the Nativity of Mary and the Infancy of the Saviour.)

Stories of this kind at Christmas eve might have been more edifying, and perhaps more acceptable, to Uncle Midas's audience than his stern criticisms, and his attempt, as he himself calls it, to show that our Lord, although so extremely a man, as he said, had had no boyhood.

He was well aware, nevertheless, that this peculiar point of view was at least novel. "Opinion commonly held, he said, that the youth of our Lord ran on in a course very much like that of the generality of poor Jewish children." But as Puss remarked impulsively, "with a show of indignation," that she could not

believe such a thing, Uncle Midas looked at her "benignantly," and said, "Nor can I, either."

Another novel feature of Uncle Midas's narrative is the effort that he made to destroy the idea, thus far prevailing, that the Holy Family was poor, and that St. Joseph had to rely upon his work as a carpenter for the support of his household.

"They say," he went on, "that Joseph, to whom as a child our Lord was subject, was a carpenter who plied only the humbler branches of the trade, and that Mary, his wife, spun the flax and wool for the family, and was a housewife. These are the circumstances chiefly relied upon," he continues, "to support the theory that the condition of the child was poverty. Now, while I admit the circumstances, I deny the conclusion. That Joseph was a carpenter signifies nothing, as the law required every Israelite, rich or poor, to follow some occupation. Now, was it not written of the exemplar of all the mothers in Israel, 'she looketh to the way of her household, and eateth not the bread of idleness?' And if we may give heed to accounts not purely scriptural, Mary owned the house in Nazareth in which the family dwelt; but, conforming to the Scriptures, it is to be remembered that amongst the gifts of the Magi there was gold, and I please myself thinking that there was enough of it to support the Holy Family while it was in Egypt and afterwards in Nazareth. . . . As to the social position of the family, it is enough to remember that, besides being a just man, Joseph was a lineal descendant of David the king."

From these premises Uncle Midas drew the conclusion that the Holy Family was "neither rich nor poor," that its condition was "comfortable," "exactly the condition to allow our Saviour a marginal time in which to taste something of natural boyish freedom, . . . to have little playmates, run races with the youngest of the flock, deck himself from the anemone-beds on the hills, and watch the clouds form slowly about the summit of Mount Hermon."

If the view thus presented were historically correct, the world must have remained for nineteen centuries under a permanent cloud of error and misrepresentation. The lesson which the always taken-for-granted condition of poverty, and dependence upon manual labor, of the Holy Family has taught to the human race, and has so efficiently contributed to alleviate social evils and render the burdens of the unfortunate lighter or more supportable, would henceforth be lost and unwarranted.

Fortunately, neither the unchanged and universal tradition of mankind, nor historical monuments of irrefutable character, can allow the subversive views of Uncle Midas, upon the supposed "comfortable" position of the Holy Family, to be entertained for a moment. So well settled the contrary assertion proves to be,

that even Protestant writers, and among them men of such immense learning and information as Alfred Edersheim, author of "The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah," not certainly well disposed either in favor of our Church or in favor of the legends above referred to, and so severely criticised by Uncle Midas, have not hesitated to maintain it boldly and squarely. "At the time of their betrothal," says Edersheim, "alike Joseph and Mary *were extremely poor*, as appears, not indeed from his being a carpenter, since a trade was regarded as almost a religious duty, but from the offering at the presentation of Jesus in the Temple."

According to the law (Leviticus, chapter xii., v. 6), the said offering should consist, under ordinary circumstances, of a lamb one year old for a burnt-offering, and a turtle-dove for a sin-offering (*agnum anniculum in holocaustum et pullum columbæ, sive turturem, pro peccato*); but when the mother was not able to get the lamb—which, like all other offerings, could be bought at the Temple—then the offering should be two turtle-doves, or two young pigeons, one for the burnt-offering and the other for the sin-offering. (*Quod si non invenerit munus ejus, nec potuerit offerre agnum, sumet duos turtures, vel duos pullos columbarum, unum in holocaustum, et alterum pro peccato.* Lev. xii., 8.)

And St. Luke says explicitly (chapter ii., v. 24) that the offering of the Blessed Virgin, in presenting her Divine Son at the Temple, was, according to the latter provision, a pair of turtle-doves or two young pigeons.

Tertullian says that Mary earned her livelihood by working; and Celsus, in the second century, said that Mary was a woman who had lived by the work of her hands.

The general tradition of mankind, and the expression given to it by art, is, and has been at all times, that St. Joseph brought up the Divine Child as a carpenter, and that Jesus exercised the craft of his foster-father. This touching and familiar aspect of the life of our Saviour, as Mrs. Jameson says (Legends of the Madonna), is specially treated in pictures painted for private oratories, and in prints prepared for distribution among the people, and became specially popular during the religious reaction of the seventeenth century. "The greatest and wisest Being who ever trod the earth was thus represented, in the eyes of the poor artificer, as ennobling and sanctifying labor and toil; and the quiet, domestic duties and affections were here elevated and hallowed by religious associations; and adorned by all the graces of art. Even when the artistic treatment was not first-rate, . . . still, if the sentiment and significance were but intelligible to those especially addressed, the purpose was accomplished, and the effect must have been good."

Had Uncle Midas in his library that pretty little book of Mrs.

Jameson's, which has just been cited, he might have read to his young visitors the beautiful description of a set of twelve prints executed in the Netherlands, exhibiting a sort of history of the childhood of our Lord, and His training under the eye of His mother, which is there made. This set of prints has for its title *Jesu Christi Dei Domini Salvatoris nostri Infantia*, and represents different domestic scenes highly interesting. In one of them St. Joseph is working as a carpenter, the Blessed Virgin is measuring linen, and the Divine Child blowing soap-bubbles. In another the Blessed Virgin is reeling off a skein of thread, St. Joseph preparing a plank, and Jesus, assisted by two angels, picking up the chips. In another St. Joseph is building up the framework of a house, and Jesus boring a hole with a large gimlet, while the Blessed Virgin is winding thread.

St. Justin, the Martyr, mentions, as a tradition of his time, that our Lord assisted St. Joseph in making yokes and ploughs. And St. Bonaventure not only describes the Blessed Virgin as a pattern of female industry, but alludes particularly to the "legend of the distaff," and mentions a tradition that, when in Egypt the Holy Family was in extreme poverty, and almost compelled to beg.

The fact that the Magi made an offering of gold, does not prove that this gold was enough to support the whole family in Egypt, and also in Nazareth, as Uncle Midas was pleased to hope; and the fact that St. Joseph was a lineal descendant of David the king is not sufficient evidence that he enjoyed the "comfortable" position in life which is ascribed to him. St. Joseph was, no doubt, a patrician, as Abbé Orsini calls him; but as the same eminent writer says ("Life of the Blessed Virgin," chapter vii.), his fortune, if any had ever been in his family, "had been absorbed by the political revolutions and religious wars of Judea, as a drop of rain is swallowed in the sea, leaving him only his tools and his arms for labor."

When one of Uncle Midas's young visitors asked him whether our Lord "did not play as other children," and whether He "did go to school," the old gentleman answered that "Jesus was preternaturally serious," and that, "if Nazareth had a school, and the better opinion is that the village was not so favored, it is to be kept in mind that scholars could not be admitted before the age of six, and that all instruction was limited to the law, and entirely oral."

With due respect to the speaker, it can be stated positively that not one of these assertions is supported by evidence. The assumption that the Divine Child, the child *par excellence*, as might be said, the most perfect, and therefore the most lovely and charming type of childhood, was nevertheless "preternaturally serious," involves a contradiction of principles which is fatal to it. Its mere enuncia-

tion makes it fall to the ground. And the ideas as to schools, and the education at Palestine at the time of the boyhood of our Lord, and the standing of Nazareth as far as learning and civilization are concerned, which Uncle Midas conveyed to his listeners, do not bear, either, too close examination.

Nazareth, as Edersheim writes, although it might seem withdrawn from the world in its enclosure of mountains, must not be thought of as a lonely village, reached only by faint echoes of what roused the land beyond. The great interests which stirred the land constantly met there. One of the great commercial routes of the world at that time led through Nazareth, and men of all nations, busy with another life than that of Israel, would appear in its streets, and through them thoughts, associations, and hopes connected with the great outside world be stirred.

On the other hand, Nazareth, was also one of the great centres of Jewish temple life, or priest centres, where the priests of the "course" which was to be on duty at the temple usually assembled in preparation for their sacred functions. "A double significance, says the learned writer above named, attached therefore to Nazareth, since through it passed alike those who carried on the traffic of the world, and those who ministered in the temple."

To say, or think, that this village was not favored with what was so common, and so well regulated, as schools were in Judea, is, to say the least, unfounded. The regular instruction of every child commenced there with the fifth or sixth year of his age. Every one of them was sent to the school. Schools were established in every town, and education was compulsory under the laws. Numerous authorities cited by Edersheim establish beyond a doubt that a city or town where there was no school was not lawfully to be inhabited by any family, and deserved to be either destroyed or excommunicated. And Jewish tradition had it that, in spite of the fabulous number of schools supposed to have existed in Jerusalem, the city fell only because of the neglect of the education of children.

These schools, sometimes called *eschule*, evidently from the Greek *schole*, where children gathered around their teachers, were destined to impart to them, first the knowledge of the alphabet and of writing, and then onwards to the farthest limit of instruction, and were conducted with extreme care, wisdom, accuracy and a moral and religious purpose as the ultimate object. To use the language of Maimonides, from whom Edersheim quotes, "encircled by his pupils as by a crown of glory," the teacher, generally the Chazzan, or officer of the synagogue, made them familiar with the precious knowledge of the law, adapting it constantly to their capacity with

unwearied patience, intense earnestness, and, above all, with the highest object of their training ever in view.

Roughly classifying the subjects of study, it was held, as Ederseim explains, that up to ten years of age the Sacred Book should be exclusively the text-book. From ten to fifteen they studied the Mishnah, or traditional law. After that age the student entered into those theological and philosophical discussions which took place in the higher academies of the rabbis. The first book of the Scripture to be studied was the Leviticus. From it they passed to the other parts of the Pentateuch, and then to the Prophets, and finally to the Hagiographa or sacred writings, which completed the Scripture. What now constitutes the Gemare or Talmud was taught in the academies.—("The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah," by Alfred Ederseim, Book ii. chap. 9.)

And why had the teaching to be necessarily oral? The possession of parts, if not of the whole, of the writings which form what we call the "Old Testament" was very common, and formed a cherished treasure in every household. From the first book of the Maccabees, chapter i., v. 59 and 60, it appears that during the great persecution which preceded their rising up in arms against the tyranny which oppressed their country, one of the obnoxious edicts of king Antiochus was, that the houses should be searched, the sacred books found in them seized and destroyed, and that "every man in whose possession a book of the testament of the Lord was found" should be put to death.

It might have been interesting for the attentive listeners of Uncle Midas to hear from him these accounts, or others, no doubt presented in a better form,—and being taught that schools, and school-laws, and school-boards, and compulsory education, and academies and universities, were things well-known not only among the Jews, but among the Egyptians, before the days of the Exodus, when Moses was a student at Heliopolis; and that even newspapers, called Mikhtabhin, appear to have been in existence in the days of the childhood of our Lord, which were not allowed to appear on the Sabbath except when dwelling on public affairs.—("The Life, etc." Book ii., chap. 2.)

When Uncle Midas has gone through with his critical analysis of the "Gospel of the Infancy," and returned the book to its place in his library, to be kept there as a standing monument of human foolishness, he makes his audience listen to those passages in the Gospels which refer to the subject which he was discussing. And as he specially dwelt upon the second chapter of St. Luke, beginning at the 39th verse, he had special delight, as it seems, in portraying, as vividly as he could, the trip from Nazareth to Jerusalem,

which ended by the incident of the losing of the child Jesus and His finding in the temple.

With what care Uncle Midas describes what he calls that "procession"! The Blessed Virgin riding on a donkey; by her, her Divine Son, our Lord, marching on foot; and close to them St. Joseph, also on foot; surrounded by James, Joseph, Simon and Jude, who he says were the sons of St. Joseph by a former marriage. Fortunately Uncle Midas, who has a great respect for the Blessed Virgin, to such an extent as to compel him to ask pardon for it in consideration of his "great love of good women," did not do as others have done, rashly and impiously, and refrained from stating that the four personages above named were brethren of our Lord in the real, material sense of the word.

That James, Joseph, Simon and Jude were not the sons of St. Joseph, and not brothers, but cousins, of our Lord, the sons of Cleophas, also called Alpheus, and of Mary, a cousin of the Blessed Virgin, is a fact so well established, even simply historically, that Uncle Midas might have done better by talking to his listeners with more accuracy. Even Protestant writers of the most bigoted disposition, upon exhaustive inquiries, have had to recognize the true relationship of the four personages above named with our Divine Redeemer; and Puss, and Nan, and John, and the others who eagerly received the words of Uncle Midas might have been much better taught, and perhaps more pleased also, if, instead of the wrong notions put by him in their heads, they would have been given a short and interesting account of the family of both St. Joseph and the Blessed Virgin, and an explanation of who were the different persons named Mary whom the Gospels mention.

This very same trip to Jerusalem, which the commandments of the law caused the Holy Family, as well as all other faithful religious observers, to make, might have been under a different, and no doubt better, spirit, extremely interesting to the children who had gathered around the speaker. St. Epiphanius and St. Bernard, cited by Orsini in his "Life of the Blessed Virgin," chapter xv., informs us that in those journeys, both going and returning, the men went in companies, separate from the women, and that St. Joseph and the Blessed Virgin were in different companies, this having been the reason why neither of them felt at first uneasy at the disappearance of Jesus, and did not perceive it until the evening, when all the travelers assembled together. Instead of giving his listeners a description of the flight into Egypt, such as a great painter has portrayed it on canvas, the Blessed Virgin riding on a donkey and St. Joseph walking by her, Uncle Midas might have copied from Orsini, and given to his listeners

an account of the groups or companies of which the travelers formed a part during the day. "Around the Virgin," he says, "were Mary of Cleophas, sister-in-law of Joseph, another Mary, designated in the Gospel by the name of *altera Maria*, Salome, the wife of Zebedee, who came from Bethsaida, . . . Johanna, the wife of Chus, and a number of Nazarenes of her family connections and neighborhood. Joseph followed them at some distance, conversing gravely with Zebedee the fisherman and the ancients of his tribe. Jesus walked amidst some young Galileans whom the Gospel, according to the genius of the Hebrew tongue, has called his brethren, and who were his near relatives."

When the passage was reached relative to the answer which our Lord gave to His mother, "how is it that ye sought Me? Did you not know that I must be about the things that are My Father's?" or "about My Father's business," as Uncle Midas's Protestant New Testament read, one of the children asked what was meant by that phrase. Uncle Midas gravely answered by giving his listeners a lesson of religious indifference, if not real irreligion. "One of the clearest observations of my life," he said, "is that people of good intent are never troubled in the matter of religion, except as they stray off into that field. In return for your trust in me, take a rule of conduct, good for every day's observance: when you hear a man talking oracularly in definition of topics which our Lord thought best to leave outside of His teachings and revelation, set it down that he is trenching on the business of the Father and the prerogatives of the Son. Then go your way and let him alone."

In other words, whenever the successors of the Apostles, whenever the Church which has, and has to have, infallible authority to teach the truth, oracularly, as Uncle Midas says, in matters of religion, proclaim a tenet, or define a topic, or fix a dogma, set it down that the one and the other are intruders in the affairs of the Father. Close your ears to their teachings, turn your backs to them, and follow your own judgment.

All missions and apostolic work are no more than intrusions. No man of *good intent* can be troubled by these matters.

If this is all that Uncle Midas learned in this world, after his sixty-five years of experience as a lawyer, a soldier, an author, a traveler, a scholar, a statesman, and a diplomatist, he was certainly to be pitied.

PROTESTANTISM AND ART.¹

DESCRIBING the effects of the "Reformation" on art is analogous to describing the effects of the great eruption of Vesuvius on Pompeii, Herculaneum, and the surrounding country. When the blinding tempest has spent itself and the Stygian flood has congealed, nothing is visible under the sun but desolation and the blackness of fire-wrought ruin. The gardens and groves, the villas and vineyards that adorned the slopes of the mountain, and the fair Greek cities lower down are buried and blotted out. The Iconoclasts of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries wrought similar havoc on the religious institutions and edifices and all they contained. To make the causes of the great catastrophe clear, it is necessary to go back to an earlier date.

The inventions and discoveries of the fifteenth century were instrumental in producing changes that no prophet predicted nor philosopher divined. They contributed to bring about revolutions and counter-revolutions, both in the objective and subjective worlds—in commerce, industry, art, science, and religion. Gunpowder had been invented and was rapidly revolutionizing the art of war. The invention of the mariner's compass and the astrolabe were revolutionizing the art of navigation. The great ocean navigators now sailed out free and far into the unknown, and discovered new worlds. The story told by Columbus on his return to Spain was charged with the magic of romance as well as the magic of science, and lifted men above the clouds. The volume of secular revelation continued to increase. The open book in the hand of the angel who had his right foot on the sea and his left foot on the land was read and devoured, for the fullness of time had come. The doubling of the Cape of Good Hope, the circumnavigation of the globe, the conquest of Mexico and Peru, were the inevitable sequel of the heroic exploits of Columbus. The discovery of Labrador by the Cabots and the St. Lawrence by Jacques Cartier, which brought England and France within the charmed circle of maritime exploration and colonial enterprise, fanned the spirit of adventure into swift activity and further extended the boundaries of knowledge. Geography, ethnography, and natural history suddenly expanded towards their natural limits, sweeping away many of the fables perpetuated or invented by Herodotus, Pliny, Marco Polo, and other historic celebrities. The invention of printing

¹ See CATHOLIC QUARTERLY for July, 1888, article "Art and Religion."

with movable types and the kindred art of engraving, or printing copies innumerable in black and white of drawings of every kind—representations of all objects—and the making of paper from linen rags, which, all three taken together in the printed and illustrated page, constitute the least perishable repository of ideas and the most potent of instrumentalities for acting on public opinion, were also products of this same wonder-breeding epoch.

The fall of Constantinople in the middle of the fifteenth century, which was immediately preceded and followed by an exodus of Greek scholars and artists, was another factor in the making of the modern world, for it gave a new and mighty impulse to the Renaissance—a movement which soon evinced a spirit of hostility to ethical Christianity. The promulgation of the Pythagorean or Copernican theory of the solar system capped the climax of the scientific movement and plumed speculative thought with daring pinion. When the pillared earth on which the sky rested became a whirling globe in the void, and in company with the peerless evening star and the other planets, and attended by the moon (unjustly called inconstant), revolving around the sun, who, clad in the majesty and terror of fire, sate enthroned in sovereign state on his own immovable centre, big-eyed wonder looked out transfixed on the fathomless mysteries of the transformed universe. The starry roof, more shadowy and unreal than a summer cloud, was dissolved and the old cosmogony vanished into space. The crystal sphere, inlaid with patens of fine gold, was resolved into incoherent innumerable units scattered through immeasurable space. All these stupendous novelties disturbed profoundly the equilibrium of the human faculties, and in the resulting reel and dizziness the foundations of the Church and of the world itself seemed to quake and fail. Imagination ran into fantasy and fantasy into magic and wild superstitions; there was white magic, and black magic, and a whole brood of diabolical delusions which owed their origin, it is believed, to the corrupt esoteric teachings of the Saracen schools in the Orient and in Spain, and which, perhaps, might be traced back to Egyptian priests and Chaldean seers in far-off times. Astrology and alchemy, phantasms of Arabian Sabianism, flourished more than at any previous period. Man's life was inexorably governed by the planets and constellations. The philosopher's stone and the elixir of life—gold and immortality—were the desiderata of pretended occult science. So-called sages and scholars searched with feverish haste for these talismans, and in the search wasted the fortunes of their disciples and dupes, and often their own lives, for they were not all impostors. Other noxious emanations from the nether world darkened the face of nature at this juncture, the most sinister and deadly of which was

witchcraft—a superstition which drank the blood of the classes that called especially for charity and protection—the old, the feeble, and the poverty-stricken.

Such was the intellectual condition of Europe at the advent of the “Reformation,” and those were the auxiliary causes of its rapid progress. Nothing was too gross for the credulity of the vulgar, provided it was a new thing. The age had drunk deeply of the Renaissance and of the new geographical and cosmical revelations. When the more potent chalice of the new theology was commended to the lips of the new generation, men drank so greedily of that chalice that many became mad—mad with that form of insanity which is contagious and which may seize a whole people of a sudden—Fanaticism.

Those movements and events down to the “Reformation” had no injurious effect on any branch of art, with one exception—miniature painting. The copying of manuscript was, of course, superseded by printing, and the art of illumination by engraving. This last was soon recognized as a legitimate form of fine art, and evidently destined to fulfil in a measure the same office for painting, sculpture, and architecture that the art of printing fulfils for letters, and, apart from that, to enter on a field exclusively its own, etching from nature—a field of which it is in full possession at present. Indeed, art steadily advanced, with the exception mentioned, till the throes of the Lutheran revolt began to shake Europe. As Beatrice grew more radiant and divine as she ascended from orb to orb, so art grew more beautiful and sublime in her gorgeous progress from decade to decade, till the great eclipse of faith in the sixteenth century “disastrous twilight shed on half the nations.” In that ghastly gloaming the spell-struck fanatic saw demons ambushed in shrine and image. Things of beauty, especially if associated with religion, instead of filling him with lofty joy, made day and night hideous to his haggard eye and perverted conscience. His zeal against idolatry became a fire and flame within him, to which the torch in the outer world soon responded.

The fall of Constantinople and the extinction of the Eastern Empire had extended the field of art in western Europe. The study and imitation of the antique were no novelties in Italy, for they were followed there from an early day by the Pisani, Squarchione, and their schools; but the Greek refugees, under the auspices of the Medici and other princes, imparted a momentum to it which determined the character of the years that followed, of which memorable years it became the dominant influence and far-shining blazon. The luxuriant results soon became marvellously apparent in art as well as literature, while in the social life and politics of the princes and nobles the smiling promise of the new spirit

soon passed into a sinister frown or a satyr-like leer—true forecasts of the lives they were doomed to lead. No doubt all this was inimical to asceticism and the temper of the cloister, and, indirectly, to Christian art, which had no longer the field exclusively to itself, but it added immensely to the repertoire of the studios. The old sculptures dug up from time to time furnished models of perfect physical form. The ample roll of mythology furnished themes for the decoration of palaces, municipal buildings, and banqueting halls. The artists, working in the new field, but still cultivating the old and greater one, acquired an amplitude of design and a freedom of fancy not permitted in sacred art. But as the pagan temples had yielded their stately columns and polished marbles to adorn the churches, so now another transition, from paganism to Christianity, but a wholly innocent and indeed edifying one, took place. The rhythmic proportions, rapt repose, and flowing lines of the Greek deities were bestowed on the saints and angels. However, this ennoblement of form was not permitted to mar the ancient Christian ideal or blur the divine sadness characteristic of the Christian types.

When it becomes necessary to tell once more what has been often told, the telling should be brief. Briefly, then, the years immediately preceding the "Reformation" were the golden age of Christian art. The fresh morning prime—the day of Giotto, of the Van Eycks, of the Pisani, of Memling, of Fra Angelico, of Verrocchio, of Massaccio, of the Bellini, of Perugino, of Martin Schongauer, passed in due season into the noontide splendor of Michael Angelo, Raphael, Titian, Leonardo, Giorgione, Francia, Albert Durer, Hans Holbein, Peter Vischer, and their hardly less famous brethren. These men were all born before the "Reformation," but all lived into it except Raphael, who died in 1520, the year Luther openly defied the Pope. Raphael and Luther were born the same year; Calvin and Michael Angelo died the same year. Melancthon, Zwingli, Henry the Eighth, Boccold, the Anabaptist, Karlstadt, the Saxon Iconoclast, Munzer, the leader of the German peasant insurrection, were all contemporaries, and also contemporaries of the great artists. John Knox was born in 1505 and John Calvin in 1509, but historically, if not strictly chronologically, they belonged to the same group as the English, German, and Swiss "Reformers." To borrow a phrase from the stage, they were all in the same cast, though some came on later than others.

At that critical, momentous period, when the earth trembled under the tread of giants, and those institutions of the Church which were overloaded with wealth and privilege were assailed by the secular powers that coveted that wealth and envied the privileges, art was still profoundly religious as well as supremely

grand. It continued to unfold its growing splendor in the churches, chapels, and oratories. By far the greater number of the works of the day—a day that was so soon to end—were designed for altars and shrines, or for the banners carried in religious processions, like the Madonna di San Sisto, or to illustrate dogma, like the Adoration of the Trinity, by Albert Durer, or the Disputa, by Raphael; or to illustrate the principal scenes in Holy Writ, like the frescoes in the Sistine Chapel. The subjects of all these *chefs d'œuvre*, and of all the *chefs d'œuvre* to be seen to-day in the museums, are taken from the supernatural, or, to say the least, the great majority of them. In the Disputa, for instance, heaven and earth, past and present, the quick and the dead, are embraced in one apocalyptic vision. Saint Thomas Aquinas and Dante, both of whom are there, seem to have given each a separate inspiration to Raphael. In short, whether we look to fresco painting, panel painting, or sculpture, we see once more, and nearly for the last time, the themes that were handled with timidity in the catacombs, and nobly developed in the basilicas, now invested with the highest attributes of beauty and power; but from the cubicula of St. Calixtus to the Arena Chapel, and thence to the Sistine, and from the Madonna in the Catacomb of Saint Priscilla (the earliest known picture of the Virgin and Child) to the Holbein and Raphael Madonnas in Dresden, first and last they are all conceived in the same spirit and fulfil the same ecclesiastical and devotional purpose, and for the fulfilment of which they were expressly designed and executed.

The greatest monument of pictorial representation the world has yet seen—the vault and the end wall of the Sistine Chapel—was created at this time. Let us dwell briefly on those gigantic achievements of Michael Angelo, as they illustrate vividly the transcendent excellence of art on the eve of the “Reformation.” In those immense frescoes there are three hundred and forty-five figures—most of them colossal—patriarchs, prophets, kings, sibyls, saints, angels, demons, Lucifer himself, and a greater than Lucifer. The series of compositions begins with the Creation and fitly ends with the Last Judgment. The Father Almighty, charioted on the wings of the cherubims by the wings of the wind, sweeping over the abyss, making the heavens and the earth, dominates the opening scene, and the Son of Man, with uplifted hand, gauntleted with wrath, the final and most fearful catastrophe. The Titanic forms in those vast compositions seem to have no affinity, except in shape, to beings of earthly mold, unless we go back to the antediluvian earth, before man lost his towering stature or his brow the brightness of the image in which he was made. To say that they excel all other pictorial works in that quality which is con-

fessedly the highest in every manifestation of art and nature,—sublimity,—is merely to repeat the unanimous verdict of the civilized world for four hundred years. They show the unexampled power of the hand as well as of the intellect and imagination of the author. The principal figures, except those in the *Inferno*, which are fitly clothed with hideousness and grizzly horror, are endowed in face and form with superhuman majesty and solemnity, as well as superhuman proportions. The muses in their flight evidently passed and paused there, and touched the mighty forms with the fire of life; and the heaven-eyed mystics, who, in those rapt moods when “thought was not,” passed the flaming bounds of space and time, touched them with a diviner ray brought down from a loftier sphere. The spirit in which the whole is conceived and executed reveals a double inspiration—the poetical and the religious; but that spirit is purely the supernatural spirit of the Middle Ages. While Michael Angelo’s architectural designs were inspired directly or indirectly by the monuments of ancient Rome, his paintings and sculptures, the truest expressions of his genius, and the most original, give ocular demonstration that they belong as wholly and truly to the mediæval cycle as the Gothic cathedrals beyond the Alps. Notwithstanding the authority to the contrary of a learned but bigoted historian (John Addington Symonds), we venture to say that no unprejudiced eye can discern in the works that cover the vast vault of the Sistine, or the vast space of the Last Judgment, any trace of the Humanist or pagan inspiration of the Renaissance, though the author in his youth was undoubtedly a protege of Lorenzo de’ Medici, and a pupil of some of the Humanist scholars patronized by that prince. It is not too much to say that the glorious chapel of the Vatican enshrines the supreme epic of Christian art since Dante, and that its place is by the side of the “*Divina Commedia*,” of which it is a translation into visible form; but years before the work was finished, that is, before the Last Judgment was painted, the Iconoclastic movement, armed with fire and sword, had swept over Europe, leaving desolation in its track.

The historians and critics all agree that the “Reformation” was hurtful to religious art, and one of the many causes of its decline, and this they say in brief and general terms. However, no competent author or other authority, as far as the writer knows, admits that it was anything more than one of the many causes of that decline, much less the sole one, and, least of all, not only of the decline of sacred art, but of all art, sacred and profane, except music and poetry.¹ This is what the writer purposes to show in the fol-

¹ Briefly, then, we find that the religious revolution, wherever it penetrated, destroyed at a blow the great function of religious art, whilst everywhere the diffusion of printing largely lessened its importance as a means of popular instruction. Mean-

lowing pages by drawing the curtain from one of the most widespread scenes of the drama of the "Reformation," the image-breaking episode, of which but a dim and distant reminiscence seems to exist even among the learned. But some mention of the doctrinal propagandism which preceded the overt acts of wanton demolition is necessary in order to give an idea of the deep-seated motive which prompted those acts, and the lasting effects of the war on images.

The cry of idolatry, as the synonym and substance of image worship, or prayers and meditations in the presence of statues and pictures representing Christ and the saints, had resounded through Europe in early ages, and had sufficient force then to split the empire and the Church. Like the simoon it came from the hot sands of the desert, but left behind it no permanent evil results, except in the Byzantine empire and the Mohammedan world.¹ The "Reformers" now raised the same cry, and a spell of preternatural power as in the olden time it proved to be. Neither the diffusion of letters, the discoveries of science, the increase of commerce, nor the general progress in civilization had weakened its malefic energy in the least. The pulpits of Wittenberg and Zurich (Calvin the supreme Iconoclast had not yet made his *debut* as "reformer") thundered against idolatry. All the maledictions uttered in the Old Testament against idol worship were now hurled against the Church. Those fierce pulpiteers—apostate priests—struck at all the dogmas and traditions which were the æsthetic motives, and, we may add, the deepest inspiration of Christian art. The Real Presence was denied. The sacraments were reduced to two or three. The invocation of saints and angels was foolishness. The worship of the Blessed Virgin was idolatry. Prayers for the dead were of no avail; for as the tree fell, it lay. There was no middle state. The saints above were inaccessible to the voice of prayer from below, and in any case powerless to help saint or sinner. There was no communion of the living and the dead. Thus the outlines of the supernatural world were blurred or blotted out, and clouds of negation spread between earth and heaven. Fasting and

while the literary Renaissance, at first by its revelation of the master-works of Greek and Roman literature, then by the renewed impulse which it gave to physical science in all its branches, created interest for men's minds, which were not only in some degree opposed to serious art, but always in competition with it.—(Professor Palgrave, Oxford, *Decline of Art*.)

¹ The crusade of the Emperor Leo, the Isaurian, seems to have bequeathed a fatal influence to all religious art wherever the Greek church prevails. Ingler's *Hand-Book of Italian Painting*, for instance, says of Russia: "Every exercise of individual power of genius is interdicted to the religious artists." The same thing is true of the painters of all the other states in the east which adhere to the Greek communion, while sculpture is unknown there.

abstinence, and especially the Lenten fasts, were of pagan origin and devoid of all merit. The higher life was scoffed at as a fanatical delusion or a cloak for the grossest sensuality. The monastic vows of poverty, chastity and humility, and the solemn covenants between the priest and the Holy Trinity were vain formulæ, of which the recording angel or the enlightened conscience took no cognizance. The Mass was a most impious and damnable incantation, the foulest of idolatrous abominations. In brief, superstition and idolatry were the warp and woof of the old religion, which was no religion at all, but the great apostacy predicted by the prophet, and the Pope was ANTI-CHRIST, the MAN of SIN, the SON of PERDITION. To sum up, the brightest stars of the Catholic firmament were wrested from their orbits, as it were, and quenched as quickly as meteors.

The "Reformers," still growing more and more radical, called trumpet-tongued for the extirpation of the whole system and the "purging" of the houses of worship. Wherever this fierce and virulent polemic gained ground, the first effects of it were to dry up the spiritual fountains and abrogate the practical conditions essential to the growth and nourishment of sacred art. The second effect was to let loose a tempest of Iconoclastic fury on the art works in the cathedrals, convents, and other ecclesiastical buildings in northern and western Europe. Saint and angel were banished from shrine and sanctuary, even where shrine and sanctuary were not yet razed to the ground. The altar was not only stripped, but wrenched from its pride of place, and degraded into a common table. The command went forth, "Since pictures and statues are idols and instruments of Satan, let them be all destroyed." The work of destruction once begun raged like a conflagration. Glass is fragile. The painted windows, one of the chief glories of Gothic architecture, were the first to fall. Tabernacles, choir stalls, episcopal chairs, organs, missals, and pictures were heaped into bonfires; statues of saints and angels, prophets and apostles, and the recumbent effigies of knights and nobles and their dames, were hammered in pieces and burned into lime. Heroic monumental art, of which there was a great deal in the crypts and the parts of the upper churches appropriated to tombs, fared no better than religious art. In many places nothing escaped, in others just enough of fragments and mutilated figures to indicate the magnitude of the disaster. The artistic product of several centuries, garnered in the sacred houses, the gifts and bequests and sepulchral monuments of pious and heroic generations, from whose loins the destroyers themselves were sprung, were all swept away by the torrent of puritanical fanaticism. Apart from the deluge of blood that inundated Europe, and the manifold suf-

ferings of the inhabitants caused by the more than hundred years of fighting between Catholics and Protestants that followed the "Reformation," there is no incident in modern history more to be regretted than this, because it robbed posterity of an inheritance invaluable in itself, and which was also a powerful aid to letters and chivalry in the extension of liberal culture. The loss was irremediable, because the spirit which had created mediæval art had fled the earth, though, happily, it sent down the new music in the person of Palestrina as a paraclete to a forsaken world.¹

The severity of this indictment calls for a specific account of the wreck and ruin perpetrated by the Iconoclasts, to show that we have attempted no exaggeration; and if the sombre outlines sketched above shall be filled in with more sombre strokes and darker colors, it is because the brush is wielded by history itself. The testimony bearing on the case is voluminous; but only Protestant authorities of recognized rank shall be quoted, and but a few, because the facts have never been disputed. This polemic, if polemic it be, is confined to the action and influence, immediate and remote, of the "Reformation" on the arts of design. Music and poetry are not within its scope, much less the graver questions of politics and social science, though one or other may incidentally intrude for a moment. The "Reformation" was not only a revolution, but the fruitful mother of revolutions; and the end is not yet. Many a laureate has sung her stormy, blood-red glories in burning phrase, and many an eloquent expositor identified her among crowding causes as the gracious mistress of modern civilization, and apostrophized her as the supreme benefactress of the human race, and her iron-tongued apostle as the grandest incarnation of heroism. The literature containing those panegyrics in prose and verse fills libraries, and he who runs may read. Those multitudinous, many-voiced laudations are not challenged here because the purpose is to keep strictly within self-prescribed limits, and as far away as possible from the arena of dogmatic controversy. Nevertheless, the question this article is attempting to elucidate, which is but a branch of a greater subject—a subject which without exaggeration may be said to reach from earth to heaven and from time to eternity—is perhaps fraught with meaning and teaching of

¹ "The peace of Westphalia, concluded in 1648, is important, however, not as marked in the introduction of new principles, but as winding up the struggle which had convulsed Germany since the revolt of Luther, sealing its results and closing definitely the period of the Reformation."—Brice, *Holy Roman Empire*, Chapter 19.

That period closed in England with the battle of Worcester, fought in 1651, and in France with the accession of Henri Quatre, although the Huguenots were in rebellion several times subsequently. The wars of the "Reformation" began in 1524, with the insurrection of the German peasants and the Anabaptist outbreak. They lasted for a century and a quarter.

vital import. The new age looking before and after and pondering the everlasting problem of man's destiny is coming, if we mistake not, to the belief that beauty and sublimity in art, and beauty and sublimity in human character, are of kindred origin, and that the religion which produces the best, and the most of the best, both in art and life, has credentials which the Sadducee, and even the atheist, must recognize. The true, the beautiful, and the good, the virtues and the graces, are all fruit from the same tree—the tree of life, which bears, we are told, twelve kinds of fruit, and the leaves of which are for the healing of the nations.

At the "Reformation" all Europe abounded in magnificent cathedrals, abbeys, priories, and churches. They were immense piles, the growth or aggregation of centuries, and were thronged with shrines and altars, very many of which were dowered with all the treasures that wealth and genius, stimulated by piety or contrition, could bestow. But no religious edifice, however small or remote, was destitute of pictures, banners, vestments, chalices, candlesticks, illuminated missals, and other requisites of the altar. These, it may be presumed, were of varying artistic quality, and some of them doubtless of no artistic quality at all; but however rude some of them might be, they were all hallowed by the association consequent on long usage. They served to instruct and edify the laity generation after generation. In short, the art treasures of the Church when the "Reformation" broke out were numberless, and unfortunately her other possessions and the *personnel* of her establishments were on a corresponding scale.

England, which is nearest to us morally, intellectually, and otherwise, first claims our notice. There, according to the historian, the "Reformation" was carried out more gradually and more mildly, less thoroughly, in fact, than in any other country. "Of all European churches," says Hume, "which shook off the yoke of the Papal authority, no one proceeded with so much reason and moderation as the Church of England." Notwithstanding this, we look in vain for reason or moderation in the treatment bestowed by the English Iconoclasts on the art possessions of the Church. On the contrary, we see nothing in their conduct but unreason, violence, and destructiveness. To begin with, Henry the Eighth (according to the historian already mentioned), "at different times suppressed six hundred and forty-five monasteries, ninety colleges, two thousand three hundred and seventy-four churches and free chapels, and one hundred and ten hospitals." The suppression of all these houses necessarily involved the destruction or dispersion of their artistic collections. This of itself would account for the decline of the artistic faculty and the scarcity of mediæval art work in that country, but worse followed. Throughout England,

says Froude, "by the year 1539 there was nothing left to tell of the presence of the saints but the names that clung to the churches they had built, or the shadowy memories which hung about their desecrated tombs. . . . Still the torrent rolled onward, monasteries and images were gone, and fancy relics in endless number. There remained the peculiar treasures of the great abbeys and cathedrals. . . . The bodies of the saints had been gathered into costly shrines which a beautiful piety had decorated with choicest offerings." Needless to add, the shrines were plundered and demolished. Not one was left in existence. It is true, St. Edward the Confessor's is still to be seen in Westminster Abbey; but it is not the original structure, but a restoration from the old building materials some considerable time after the walls were pulled down.¹

With the advent of the young Edward, and the rule of Protector Somerset, a new and hungrier brood of zealots appeared on the stage, ravening for the last remnants of the possessions of the Church. There was little left—the fragments of what the first comers were unable to devour—but yet enough to whet the appetite for spoils, and inflame the mania of image breaking. We quote again from Froude: "Injunctions were issued for the general purification of the churches. From wall and window, every picture, every image commemorative of saint, or prophet, or apostle was to be extirpated and put away so that there should remain no memory of the same. Painted glass survives to show that the order was imperfectly obeyed; but in general, spoliation became the law of the land—the statues crashed from the niches; rood and rood-loft were laid low, and the sunlight stared on the whitened aisles. . . .

"The cathedrals and the churches of London became the chosen scenes of riot and profanity. St. Paul's was the stock exchange of the day, where the merchants of the city met for business, and the lounge where young gallants gathered, fought, and killed each other. They rode their horses through the aisles and stabled them among the monuments. . . .

"As to the mass of the people, hospitals were gone, schools broken up, almshouses swept away; every institution which Catholic piety had bequeathed for the support of the poor was either abolished or suspended; and the poor themselves, smarting with rage and suffer-

¹ The account of the pillage and demolition of the shrine of St. Thomas in Canterbury Cathedral—the richest shrine in the world—is a very curious page of "Reformation" history. The saint, who had been dead for centuries, was cited to appear in court in London and be tried for treason. Not obeying the summons, he was condemned in his absence as a traitor, upon which the king "ordered his name to be struck out of the calendar, the office of his festival to be expunged from all breviaries, his bones to be burned and the ashes to be thrown in the air."

ing and seeing piety, honesty, duty, trampled under foot by their superiors, were sinking into savages. . . . Missals were chopped in pieces with hatchets, college libraries plundered and burned. The divinity schools were planted with cabbages and the Oxford laundresses dried clothes in the schools of arts."—(Froude's "History of England," vol. v. chapter 77.)

Knowing that the England of to-day is not an artistic country, the Philistine and the cynic may be skeptical as to the value and number of the works destroyed, and also, perhaps, as to the excellence of all art of the mediæval period, or even disposed to sit in the seat of the scorner, like Carlyle—true in this one thing to the teaching of John Knox—and sneer at the fine arts one and all, and of all climes and times. But the Gothic cathedrals, steeped in pensive beauty, and breathing, though faintly now, the odors of ancient sanctity, still stand to shame the scorner and confound the ignorant. These majestic fabrics testify in no doubtful way to the unsurpassed splendor of the artistic genius of the English as well as their profound piety, before the "Reformation"; but on this head we are not left to mere deduction, as witness the following from a late work by a learned divine of the English church:¹

"Now up and down this land of England there are, say, five thousand churches that at this moment stand upon the same foundations that they stood upon five hundred years ago; some few of them standing in the main as they were left eight centuries ago. If for five thousand any one should suggest, not five thousand, but ten thousand, I should find no fault with the correction.

"If we go back in imagination to the condition of these churches as they were left when the Reformation began, it may safely be affirmed that there was not at that time, there never had been, and there is never likely to be again, anything in the world that could at all compare with our English churches. There never has been an area of anything like equal extent so immeasurably rich in works of art such as were then to be found

¹ We find the following in Lubke's *History of Sculpture*: "In England, where historical and political feeling are so highly developed, we should expect above all a monumental art. But just as little as the English have taste or talent for higher historical painting, have they been able to develop an important plastic art. There is no lack of monuments of their great men; but they are throughout so unsuccessful, so devoid of style, yet at the same time so completely without any vigorous conception of nature, that we are inclined to doubt if they possess any higher plastic talent." But this is mild in comparison with the utterances of Leighton (Sir Frederick), Alma Tadema, and other shining lights of the artistic world at the convention of "Arts and Crafts" held in London last November. The speakers, all artists of more or less distinction, asserted and deplored the insensibility—the deadness—of the English people as a whole to every form of art, and their incapacity to discriminate between good and bad art.

within the four seas. The prodigious and incalculable wealth stored up in the churches of this country in the shape of sculpture, glass, needlework, sepulchral monuments in marble, alabaster, and metal—the jewelled shrines, the precious MSS.—their bindings, the frescoes and carved work, the vestments and exquisite vessels in silver and gold, and all the quaint and dainty and splendid productions of an exuberant artistic appetite, and an artistic passion for display, which were to be found not only in the great religious houses, but dispersed more or less in every parish church in England, constituted such an enormous aggregate of precious forms of beauty as fairly baffles the imagination when we attempt to conceive it. There are lists of the *church goods*, *i.e.*, of the contents of churches, by the thousands, not only in the sixteenth century, but in the fourteenth; there they are for any one to read; and, considering the smallness of the area and the poverty of the people, I say again that the history of the world has nothing to show which can for one moment be compared with our English churches as they were to be found when the spoilers were let loose upon them. Well! We all know that a clean sweep was made of the *contents* of these churches. The locusts devoured all. But the *fabrics* remained—the fabrics have remained down to our time—they are, as it were, the glorious framework of the religious life of the past.”¹

It remains to be added that further demolition of fane and sacred symbol marked the triumphant progress of the Calvinists during the great rebellion. The sword of the Puritan was edged with as keen a fanaticism as the scymitar of the Mussulman. The Long Parliament, when it relaxed from the more serious business of massacreing the Irish and murdering witches, seems to have given the last touch to the work of the Iconoclasts.² Assuming regal power, it issued orders for the demolishing of all images, altars and crucifixes, which act would imply that some relics of the old religion still survived. They had been hidden, perhaps, or escaped because they were in out-of-the-way places. “The zealous Sir Robert Harley,” says Hume (to whom the execution of these orders was committed), “removed all crosses even out of street and market, and from his abhorrence of that superstitious figure, would not anywhere allow one piece of wood or stone to lie over another at right angles.” The Root and Branch men

¹ “The Coming of the Friars, and other historic essays,” by the Rev. Augustus Jessop, D.D., 1889.

² The era of the Long Parliament was that, perhaps, which witnessed the greatest number of executions for witchcraft. Three thousand persons are said to have perished during the continuance of the sittings of that body by legal execution, independently of summary deaths at the hands of the mob.—*Chambers's Encyclopædia*.

were now riding the whirlwind and guiding the storm. Canterbury and other cathedrals were further purged by acts of Parliament. Litchfield had undergone a siege and bombardment; Lincoln escaped, though the bishop's palace was burned down. Westminster, which had suffered least of any, because the two cities, London and Westminster, had always adhered to the Parliamentary cause, was only turned into a barrack where the soldiers contented themselves by breaking up the organ, dining regularly on the communion table and, dressed in surplices, playing hounds and hare in the aisles.

In passing from England to the Continent, we find the "Reformation" growing more radical in doctrine and more destructive in deed. The destroyers were now infuriated mobs. Luther himself was, perhaps, the most conservative, although the most vituperative of all the "Reformers," and no Iconoclast. He looked on the sacred figures in the churches with an indifferent, not a hostile, eye, and he was devoted to music and hymnody—a quality in him which has borne fruit in all the Lutheran countries—but the movement which he led was instinct with Iconoclasm from the beginning, and in that direction quickly passed beyond his control. During his seclusion in Wartburg, one of his disciples, Karlstadt, inflamed the common people in Saxony by his denunciation of idolatry. The usual consequences followed. Frenzied crowds broke into the churches and destroyed the works of art. Luther, on learning this, hastened from his retreat, where he had been lying *perdu*, and, by the exercise of his authority and the eloquence of his rebukes, put a stop to Karlstadt's crusade and suppressed, for a time, the fanaticism of his followers. The Anabaptist, Munzer, took up the torch which Karlstadt had let fall, and set several of the German states, including all upper Germany, aflame with his wild doctrines and rabid exhortations. The peasant insurrection, which he instituted and led, was the blackest episode in the history of the Protestant movement of that country; and church wrecking and idol smashing were the least of the outrages perpetrated by the fanatics.¹ When the insurrection was suppressed and Munzer beheaded, many of his followers took refuge in the Low Countries and Westphalia, where they continued to propagate their political and religious notions. Two of their prophets, one from Haarlem and one from Leyden, settled in the imperial city of Münster, where these zealots made many converts. The sect attempted more than once to get possession of the place; but at last, calling in secretly their brethren from Holland, they arose at night in

¹ No such insurrection, so widespread, so sanguinary, and so ruthless in its vengeance had ever before disquieted Germany as that which marked the close of the year 1524.—*Encyclopædia Britannica*.

great tumult, seized the public buildings, created a panic among the people, who fled in terror before the frantic multitude of strangers that howled as they charged through the streets, and who took the sleeping citizens as much by surprise as the Greeks did the sleeping Trojans. The inevitable result followed. The contents of all the churches in Münster and the surrounding country were speedily reduced to ashes, and after a while the churches themselves devoted to destruction, because Boccold, the prophet and leader, prophesied that whatever was highest on earth should be brought low, and the churches were the loftiest buildings of the city! Somehow they escaped, notwithstanding.

In the Netherlands, or Holland, as we say now, where not a few of the followers of Munzer took refuge, the most radical Calvinistic doctrines prevailed, and consequently the frenzy of image-breaking fiercely raged. Between the "Reformation" and the wars that grew out of the "Reformation" in that country, all pre-"Reformation" art was well-nigh swept away. There was an endless store of it, for the Dutch were a gifted people in the ages of faith. But almost all perished. "We shall never," says a learned contemporary writer, "indeed, possess more than scraps and fragments of information about the earliest Dutch painters, those of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, for their works and their very names perished in the frightful and disastrous confusion of the Reformation, the religious wars and the struggle with Spain."¹ It is impossible, the writer goes on to say, to do more than guess what the world lost by the Iconoclastic movement in Holland in the sixteenth century. A common oblivion seems to have swallowed up the names of the artists and their productions as well as the names of the incendiaries who made a *tabula rasa* of the country as far as the Church was concerned. To this a single observation may be added: The sculptors and their works shared the fate of the painters and their works. Lubke, in his "History of Sculpture," fails to mention a single marble or bronze, a carved or molten image, in all Holland, or the name of a Dutch sculptor of the fifteenth or sixteenth century.

What happened in that part of the Netherlands we now call Belgium is described by Motley in one of his most eloquent passages.² We extract some sentences, but the whole chapter should be read:

"The Netherlands possessed an extraordinary number of churches and monasteries. Their exquisite architecture and elaborate decoration had been the earliest indication of intellectual culture displayed in the country. . . ."

¹ *Les chefs d'œuvre du Musée Royal d'Amsterdam*, par A. Bredius, Traduction Française, par Emile Michel.

² *Rise of the Dutch Republic*, vol. i., chap. 7. Motley, though he depicts in vivid colors the destruction, does his best to excuse the authors of it.

"All that science could invent, all that art could embody, all that mechanical ingenuity could dare, all that wealth could lavish—all gathered round these magnificent temples. . . .

" . . . Many were filled with paintings from a school which had precedence in time and merit over its sister nurseries of art in Germany. All were peopled with statues. All were filled with profusely adorned chapels. . . .

" . . . And now, for the space of only six or seven days and nights, there raged a storm by which all these treasures were destroyed. Nearly every one of these temples was rifled of its contents. Art must forever weep over this bereavement. . . .

"The mob rose in the night in Antwerp and began by wrecking the great cathedral church of Our Lady, and before morning they had sacked thirty churches within the walls. . . .

"A troop of harlots, snatching waxen tapers from the altars, stood around the destroyers and lighted them at their work. . . .

"They destroyed seventy chapels, forced open all the chests of treasure, covered their own squalid attire with the gorgeous robes of the ecclesiastics, and burned the splendid missals and manuscripts.

" . . . A colossal and magnificent group of the Saviour crucified between two thieves adorned the principal altar. The statue of Christ was wrenched from its principal place . . . while the malefactors, with bitter and blasphemous irony, were left on high."

The havoc, as Motley calls it, began in Antwerp. The Calvinistic mob rose in the night and first gutted the great Cathedral—the Church of our Lady. Before morning they had sacked thirty churches within the walls. "Two days and nights longer the havoc raged unchecked through all the churches of Antwerp and the neighboring villages. Hardly a statue or picture escaped destruction. The number of churches desecrated has never been counted. In the single province of Flanders four hundred were sacked. . . . In an hour the convent of Marchiennes, the most beautiful abbey in Flanders, was laid in ruins. . . . Pictures, statues, organs, chalices of silver and gold, lamps, censers, vestments glowing with pearls, rubies, and precious stones, were destroyed or stolen." Similar scenes took place in Valenciennes, Tournay, and Ghent. Great, indeed, was the havoc, but the incendiaries were interrupted at Anchin, where they were attacked and dispersed. Limburg, Luxemburg, and Namur thus escaped the terrible visitation. Flanders was then, as it is to-day, a Catholic country at bottom; and this explains why many glorious specimens of early Flemish art may still be seen, some there, but many more in foreign collections, whither they found their way to save them from the dangers which threatened them at home.¹

¹ One of Michael Angelo's noblest works, a statue of the Blessed Virgin, with the infant Saviour, is in the Cathedral at Bruges. The hospital there is adorned with exquisite religious paintings from the hand of Hans Memling. The famous work of the brothers Van Eyck, the Adoration of the Mystic Lamb, or the Agnes Dei, or at least the better part of the picture, is in St. Bavon's in Ghent. The Calvinists of that place wanted to give it to Queen Elizabeth.—(See *Early Flemish Painters*, Crowe and Cavalcasselle.)

The epidemic of image breaking fell on Switzerland in 1529, in which year the cantons that followed the teachings of Zwingli abolished altars, images and organs. In any case these were now superfluous, for religious service in the churches was reduced to extemporaneous prayers and extemporaneous sermons—both, it is hardly necessary to remark, of inordinate length. Woltmann and Woermann, in their “History of Painting,” say: “Many of Holbein’s religious paintings must have perished in the Iconoclastic mania which fell upon Basle in 1529, but those that remained sufficed to reveal his greatness.”

Identical, or, correctly speaking, more lurid scenes were witnessed in France. There is, in fact, a dreary similitude, a servile imitativeness, in the acts of Iconoclasts of every age and clime. But the Huguenots are at least entitled to the palm for outdoing all others of their day. Whether because their hatred of idolatry came direct from a Frenchman, or because of the more inflammable nature of the Gaul, they wielded torch and sledge-hammer with more deadly effect than even the German Anabaptists, and on a much wider scale. From them came the spirit which possessed the “Reformation” in Holland and the doctrines which its apostles propagated there. “Wherever the Huguenots prevailed,” says Hume, “the images were broken, the altars pillaged, the churches demolished, the monasteries consumed with fire.” Later, the Jacobin followed the track of the Huguenot, destroying much of what had remained. Between them so little escaped that the German authorities quoted above open the seventh chapter of their “History of Painting” with the statement: “How much or how little of the real genius of the French nation was expressed by her early painters it is hard to tell, for the storms of revolution dealt more disastrously with the ancient art in France than in almost any other land.”

In Scotland the campaign was appropriately initiated by John Knox. In Perth one Sunday he preached a fierce sermon against the idolatry of the Mass which fired the rabble, who proceeded straightway to wreck the churches and monasteries of that city, and did wreck them before the dawn of the second day. From Perth the wild contagion spread. The “Congregation” took up the word, and in a short time masses of blackened ruins marked the sites of the cathedrals and monastic houses. Even the great abbey of Scone, where the kings of Scotland were crowned from time immemorial, was laid in ashes. The holy places, of which there were many, were defiled. The native incendiaries escaped the parricidal guilt of demolishing Melrose, because it had already been burned down by the English. Its lofty, though broken, arches and massive walls will long perpetuate the memory of that

insensate sacrilege. The historical student may well think that one place at least would have been spared—Iona—the primitive seat of learning and civilization, founded a thousand years before by St. Columbkille and his associate monks from Ireland, to whom Scotland is indebted, not only for her very name, but for all that makes her early history worth perusing. But Iona shared the fate of all other monastic establishments. The ruthless and rapacious nobles, headed by Argyll, were worse than the city mobs, for the latter were impelled by blind fanaticism, while greed, and revenge springing from hereditary feuds, were the inspiring motives of the former. No feeling of nationality, no reverence for antiquity, served to protect those noble monuments, consecrated though they were by saintly and heroic names and traditions, going back to the very limit of historic time. In compensation for all that, the Scotchman can now behold the huge form of John Knox on his pillar, towering spectre-like in the grimy atmosphere of Glasgow, and darkly overshadowing the whole mount of the Necropolis.¹ The rapidity and thoroughness with which the Scotch "Reformers" performed their *Godly* task is well summed up in three lines by a great poet, who sometimes, as in this instance, falls into puerility and bathos. Wordsworth, in the "Excursion," calls them

"Godly men, who swept from Scotland, in a flame of zeal,
Shrine, altar, image and the massy piles
That harbored them."

Nor was the Iconoclastic movement limited to what may be called Protestant territory, or territory partly Catholic and partly Protestant. Catholic countries, too, felt its force. In this, as in so many other things, Ireland was a hapless victim. The invader it was that fired her temples, as the Persians fired those of Greece, and the Moslems those of Eastern Christendom. It is true that when Henry the Eighth suppressed the monasteries he found the Irish chieftains just as greedy for spoils as the Anglo-Norman barons. In fact, he enlisted the concurrence, or at least the acquiescence, of both classes in the enterprise, by giving them rich gifts

¹ The Glasgow Presbyterians are no longer prejudiced against images. In November, 1877, after visiting the cathedral, a Gothic church of the olden time, justly celebrated, the writer directed his steps towards another church in the vicinity which he took to be a Catholic church, because marble statues of heroic size of the twelve Apostles, St. Peter with his keys and St. Paul with his sword at the head of them, stood on the roof. On coming up to the church he discovered that it was a church of the United Presbyterians.

Dr. Talmage, in a sermon delivered on the 28th of October, took the "Divine Mission of Pictures" as his subject, and spoke eloquently of the spirit of Pope Gregory the Second's letter to the Iconoclastic emperor, Leo the Isaurian, on the salutary uses of sacred pictures.

out of the confiscated lands. The result, of course, was the decay and ruin of the abbeys and kindred edifices. The churches and cathedrals lived to a later day, but many of them were demolished during the Elizabethan and Cromwellian wars. The few that survive were taken from their owners and handed over to Protestants, who hold them to this day. Altered as they were to suit the new form of worship, they are but the skeletons of their former selves; but they are indebted for their preservation, so far as they have been preserved, to the change of ownership. These and a number of the round towers are the only ecclesiastical structures that have escaped the all but universal wreck; and of the latter only a few are found in their original condition. Ireland, however, is studded with magnificent ruins, not a few of which, like Cormac's Chapel on the rock of Cashel, antedate the coming of Strongbow and Henry the Second, and these, taken in connection with the round towers and the groups of small stone-roofed churches still extant, though in ruins, prove that the island had an architecture of her own, which was as purely original as her matchless metal work, her illuminated manuscripts and sculptured crosses. All the way from Derry to Donegal, from Mayo to Armagh, from Clare to Wicklow, are found the remains of abbeys, friaries, priories, and churches, some of which, like those on the rock of Cashel and in Cong and Sligo and Kilmallock (ancient capital of the Desmonds), show exquisite architectural forms and rich sculptural ornamentation. The parish churches throughout the land were also demolished during the Cromwellian and subsequent priest-hunting times, and in their moss-covered stones the rising generation finds sermons little in accord with the peace of the forty generations who sleep in the surrounding churchyards. The ruins of castles and donjon towers may also be seen, and humbler but sadder ruins, which have no background of antiquity and are touched with no beauty. Coming to this, one is seized with the thought that descanting on architectural ruins in the presence of the moral ruins that cast their darker shadows over hill and valley, is irrelevant diletantism and almost mockery. The conquerors laid the polity, the jurisprudence, the literature, the language, and the industries of the people in ruins. They stripped the Celt of all his worldly possessions. They created a void wherein for long intervals nothing is visible but the *disjecta membra* of a mutilated nationality. They attempted to lay Irish human nature itself in ruins by dooming the Catholic to perpetual poverty, serfdom, and ignorance. The Invincible, the Dynamiter, the Moonlighter, are Frankensteins fashioned by those veritable miscreators. With pleasure let it be admitted that for sixty years they have been trying with more or less expedition—chiefly less—to abate the entailed evils of the penal laws; and for

more than a decade to reform the cruel and corrupted feudal tenures which worked invariably for the expulsion or extermination of the tillers of the soil.

This brief survey will be fitly finished by turning for a moment to Rome. Far away as the Pontifical city is from Saxony and Switzerland, from Wittenburg and Zurich, she yet was scathed and wrecked by the terrible *tramontane* that swept down the whole length of the peninsula. Rome was the theatre of perhaps the most deplorable incident of the whole widespread campaign against religious art, because that city more abounded in works of high art than any other place. Its siege in 1527 by the troops of the Emperor Charles the Fifth, under the Constable de Bourbon, was followed by the most shocking outrages which a licentious soldiery can inflict on a defenceless community. Happily, any further allusion to these unmentionable things is not called for here. Suffice it to say that the troops pillaged church and palace indiscriminately, beginning with St. Peter's and the Vatican. After despoiling princes and prelates, bankers and merchants, of everything within sight or search, they put the victims of their robbery to the torture to extort confession of hidden treasure, and subsequently held them to heavy ransom. They threw into the same melting pot altar vessels from the days of Constantine and drinking cups fresh from the chisel of Benvenuto Cellini, for the metal was the one thing they were capable of appreciating. They made booty of the jewels, vestments, tapestries, laces, embroideries of the altars—in short, of all that allured their cupidity or excited their admiration. Nor did they stop there. The German-Lutheran contingents of the Imperial army, which were much the largest part of it, were filled with the same holy horror of images as their brethren in the North. To break or burn pictures or statues was a labor of love with them; and, accordingly, they proceeded to destroy altar-pieces and graven images wherever they found them, and they were easily found. They destroyed the painted windows of the Vatican designed by Raphael and executed by Gulielmo da Marsiglia, the greatest master of glass painting that has ever lived. They effaced several heads of Raphael's frescoes in the Stanze, and doubtless would have left Rome as bare as a sectarian conventicle, or the whitewashed interiors spoken of by Froude, if their occupation of the city had lasted much longer. They did more damage during their stay of two months than their ancestors, the Goths and Vandals, had done, from Alaric down.¹

¹ Les places devant toutes les églises étaient gonchées des ornements d'autel, des reliques, et de toutes les choses sacrées, que les soldats jetaient dans la rue, après en avoir arraché l'or et l'argent. Les luthériens allemands, joignant le fanatisme religieux à la cupidité, s'efforçaient de montrer leur mépris pour les pompes de l'église

It is unnecessary to pursue this quest. The same phenomena appeared whenever and wherever the "Reformation" prevailed, even temporarily. All Europe now became involved in what are called religious wars, complicated with dynastic struggles. The muses may glorify heroes and sing the fierce joys of battle before the war begins and also when it is over, but while the clash of arms is heard they are as silent as the laws which should protect the people. The wars that grew out of the "Reformation" failed to touch a single one of the sacred nine with any sentiment but mute sorrow. There is no epos of that long, protracted, weary struggle, nor is there any monumental record of it in pictorial, plastic, or architectural art. The era of church building naturally closed when the era of church burning began. There is one exception to this: Though the ark of the Church was buffeted by a fiercer storm of "felon winds" than any previously encountered, yet, as if to demonstrate that while she lives art will live, the lofty dome of St. Peter's arose at this time on the Vatican hill. If that peerless shrine has an expression and intellectual meaning that gives it a unique aspect, outside and inside, and that distinguishes it from all other architectural wonders, it is that of tranquil joy blended with Olympian grandeur, qualities which the exalted imagination immediately recognizes as meet attributes of the Church, no longer militant, but now and forever triumphant; no gloom or shadow, but the brightness of day in the vast spaces, lateral and longitudinal, of the interior, the intersection of which is marked by the tomb of the Apostles, which thrice sacred spot is overhung by that radiant dome, sky-born, verily descended from the orb'd Heaven, of which it is the symbol, and which brought down with it the airs of Heaven; everywhere and in everything that largeness of style, that breadth of effect, which nature has imparted to mountain forms and landscape distances seen from mountain heights; the whole lapped in the elysium of a climate of its own, the grateful temperature of which is the same in all seasons. Well might it have inspired the meteor bard of hostile creed and alien tongue with a hymn of praise worthy of the Hebrew Psalmist. Yet the hundred years it took to build was a hundred years of decadence, as the statues within and without testify; their inferiority to the architectural design, as well as their incongruity, is obvious.

romaine, et de profaner ce que respectaient les peuples qu'ils nommaient idolâtres. Cependant, après le premier jour de fureur, dans lequel ils auraient voulu égorger tous ceux qui avaient porté les armes, les Allemands ne tirèrent plus l'épée; ils l'adoucirent même tellement que leurs prisonniers purent le racheter d'eux après bon compte. Dès lors ils ne songèrent plus qu'à boire, à ramasser de l'argent, et à détruire les tableaux et les statues qui leur paraissaient des monuments d'idolâtrie.—(Sismondi, *Republiques Italiennes*.)

Of course, this does not apply to Michael Angelo's "Pieta," than which no group of sculpture in existence, not even the "Laocoon," is so full of ideal pathos.

Had the work of the sixteenth century Iconoclast been confined to the abolition of outward things, art would probably have risen bright and buoyant from her ashes. There is hardly one of the existing mediæval cathedrals that has not been wholly or partially destroyed by fire at one time or another; but down to a comparatively late date each new reconstruction was an improvement almost always on its predecessor, because the ideas and material conditions which prevailed when the original structures were founded lasted to the "Reformation," and art tradition was till then unbroken, while art herself continued to expand with the years. To tear down the golden branch, however heavily laden with fruit and flower, does not necessarily kill the tree, much less blight the whole academic grove:

"Primo avulso non deficit alter."

The innate powers that dwell in the penetrating roots and the lordly trunk suddenly sprout out again in another golden branch, having all the beauty and mystic virtue of that which it replaces. The golden age of Athenian art immediately succeeded the overthrow and expulsion of the Persian invaders, who had laid the temples of Greece in ashes, and left nothing visible on the summit of the Acropolis but a heap of ruins, a mountain on a mountain. Yet in a few short years the austere deity, who smote the impious hordes of barbarians with terror and the madness of terror, was able to look down again on her beloved city of the Triple Crown, now more glorious than before—luminous with the aureole of all Olympus—from the new and diviner temple in which she was enshrined. The ruins of the Parthenon, sculptural and architectural, still awaken divine emotion in Christian souls, idols and of the house of idols though they were. The temples now rose in greater splendor, and the great Homeric statue of Jupiter at Olympia, with that of Athene just alluded to, also colossal, both of ivory and gold, the masterpieces of Phidias and of all ancient plastic art, rose contemporaneously. Fire and sword may destroy works of art, but they are powerless to destroy art itself, which is an organic thing. To reach that consummation, to extirpate it at the root—where only it can be extirpated—a third factor must be called into action, the spiritual element in the soul, and this Calvinism did. Hence in Protestant Europe art practically died out. The religious houses were suppressed. The monks were homeless wanderers. The abbeys were secularized; and when not pulled down turned into private mansions; dwellings for the

favorites upon whom they were bestowed, and who hung their chambers with the vestments and tapestries of the altars. The secular clergy of all classes were impoverished by the spoliations they were subjected to. The irreverence of the demoralized and brutalized multitude helped to complete the wreck which the fanatics had made. The nobles and courtiers, among whom the houses and lands of the Church and the riches of the shrines were distributed, could not in the nature of the things be patrons of art, and no other class had the means of exercising patronage. There was no longer any incentive to the production of art, and no class or institution to sustain the artist. There was no longer employment for him, and no hope of employment. He belonged to the world before the flood and found himself an alien and anachronism. He therefore disappeared from the scene to reappear in another age. But, oh! how fallen, how changed!

Of all the religious movements in the history of the race, the "Reformation" is the only one that has proved utterly sterile on the side of art. It has produced no new architecture, no new painting or sculpture, no new music, not even a new ritual. Whatever it possesses of æsthetic quality in its temples and services, is derived from the Church. Israel, standing in the midst of idolatrous nations, was forbidden the use of images; but Solomon built the temple of the God of Israel on Mount Zion, for no subtlety of imagination or magical rite can pervert architectural forms which are geometrical figures into likenesses of living things or supernatural personalities; and yet inside in the "most holy house" were the two cherubims of "image work," standing in the light of their golden wings twenty cubits long, extending from wall to wall of that house, and typifying, if we may be permitted to say so, the bright cloud that one day was to overshadow Mount Tabor. There were also graven cherubims on the walls, and wrought cherubims on the veil of blue and purple, and crimson and fine linen; and the molten images of oxen supporting the Molten Sea—so inevitable is the affinity of powerful supernatural ideas for form and color. But outside the walls of the temple in Jerusalem, in Judea, throughout the land of the Twelve Tribes, no image was to be seen, no household god under any roof, no monumental stone on any high place or haunted hollow. The danger of idolatry was imminent, and the fear of it intense and all pervading during the brief hour of Israel's prime. Consequently there was no art, and no place or function for art, among the Jews; but the stream of æsthetic feeling, dammed on one side, flowed out with more power and volume on that which was open to it, and accordingly music and song became the chief mediums of expression of that people. The harp of David was consecrated to the

Lord, and thrilled with sublimer strains than Apollo's lute. He clad his lofty prayers in the concord of sweet sounds. All primitive music was religious music. Christian psalmody had its origin in the temple. The Jew, debarred from painting and sculpture, has ever since, especially since the Dispersion, found compensation in the art which borrows nothing from the external world but the vibrations of the molecules of the atmosphere. Even Mohammedanism, fiercely fanatical as it is, and abhorrent of the image, has developed an art of its own possessing nobleness and individuality, and distinguished also by original architectural features and a fertility and brilliancy of ornamentation never surpassed. As in the case of Judaism, from which it sprang, architecture was not forbidden to the Arab faith. Caliphs and commanders of the faithful, and their lieutenants, hastened to build palaces and mosques in the principal cities of the kingdoms they subjugated. Many of these buildings still exist, and rank high in the category of architectural creations. Witness the mosques of Cairo, the Jussuf Mosque in Tunis, the Pearl Mosque of Agra, the Tajh Mahal, the Mosque of Omar, the Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem, the Alhambra. The interiors were profusely decorated in the bright colors of glass mosaics, with geometrical patterns of inexhaustible variety, endless interlacing, and even conventional animal and floral forms; and the windows of many of them are of painted glass, and still shine like jewels.¹ Their system of ornamentation penetrated deeply into all industries, producing beautiful tissues and exquisite objects of all kinds, in metal, clay, and ivory.

The shrines of Ceylon and Japan show that the mighty Buddha, who really was a reformer, has a soul for art as well as for the whole sentient creation. How long his powers will last is another question. For a form of Protestantism in the guise of modern civilization has entered his dominions. The Mikado is suppressing monasteries and appropriating their estates. The court ladies have discarded the national costume and wear the fabrications of Worth. The effect of this European invasion will certainly be the extinction of the national genius and the degradation of the national character. Protestantism, as far as art is concerned, is manifestly not a creative, but a destructive and petrifying principle. It ploughs with the ploughshare of ruin, and sows the furrows with salt.

If art was "quenched like fire" in Protestant countries, its lustre was dimmed in Catholic countries. The mephitic blasts from the

¹ The Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem is especially celebrated for its windows. There is no doubt that Arab art sprang from Byzantine art, though the pointed arch, it is said, is of Arab origin.

banks of the Elbe and of the Lake of Zurich blew chill and heavy on the banks of the Arno and the Tiber. Protestantism entered Italy in more than one form, and, according to Sismondi, made considerable progress among the literati. We know that Clement Marot and Calvin found asylum there when they fled from France. We have seen what the German Lutherans accomplished in Rome; and the moral effect of their work there, and in the other Italian cities which they entered, could not have been other than disastrous. The face of heaven was now overcast by the spirit of the age, which was the spirit of the "Reformation;" and as the heavenly hierarchies grew faint in the skies, they faded out of art. Fortune seemed to smile on the enemies of the Church, and the worldly, who are always a great multitude, are seduced by her smile, and follow her banner.¹ Doubt shook many minds, and where doubt failed to penetrate, despondency entered. Inspiration, if it had not entirely vanished, was a rare visitant in the studio. Cold imitation was substituted for invention. "We paint what we love," says Taine; and we love and can love only what we believe in as really existing. The loss of faith was the cause of the extinction of art in one region; the decline of faith was the cause of the decline of art in another. But many secondary causes contributed to the decline of Italian art; the most formidable of which was the succession of the bloody wars of France on the one side, and Germany and Spain on the other, in which the Papacy and the minor states were almost always involved. The discovery of the new route to India impoverished the maritime cities, indeed all the cities, and they have never recovered from the blow. The fall of the central republics, Florence, Sienna, Lucca, Genoa, followed. Venice alone remained; but she, too, was losing her oriental trade, the great source of her wealth and splendor. The Spaniards became masters, though not protectors, of the country, which was scourged for long years by corsairs from without and brigands from within, who carried on their depredations with impunity. Freedom, commerce, and industry were overthrown; poverty overspread the land, paralysis fell on the body politic, and lethargy on the Church. Art could no longer flourish in such a dismal and chaotic world. Independent Italy consisted merely of Venice and the Papal states. But at this very time Wisdom descended again on the Papacy in tongues

¹ "And I who straightway looked beheld a flag,
Which, whirling round so rapidly
That it no pause obtained; and following came
Such a long train of spirits, I should ne'er
Have thought that death so many had despoiled."

Cary's "Dante," Canto third.

of fire. The Papacy arose to the full height of its spiritual stature. Its creative energies, which had slumbered during the reign of the lotus-eating Pontiffs of the Renaissance, started into new life and worked as in the days of Gregory the Seventh and Innocent the Third. The Tiara shone from a troubled sky, a guiding star, on the nations emerging from the deluge of the "Reformation." The revival of religion spread far and fast, and, in obedience to the eternal law, was followed by the revival of art.

"ROBERT ELSMERE" AS A CONTROVERSIAL NOVEL.

THE novel of Mrs. Humphrey Ward, "Robert Elsmere," has excited very great interest, both in England and in the United States. We would rather leave to more competent hands the pronouncing on the literary merits of the book. They must be of no mean quality if we are to take the sudden popularity which the book has acquired as a standard of real sterling worth. We presume, however, that the interest which it has commanded can be partly accounted for by the controversial portion of the book, if the one-sided argument made in favor of Rationalism and against orthodox Christianity can be graced with the name of controversy. In fact, we are free to confess to be at a loss to discover the intention of the gifted authoress in filling and inoculating her book with so much theological lore. We have a shrewd guess that she intended to make in favor of Christianity one of those arguments called *ex absurdis*. The reasons which commend such a guess to our minds, and which invest it with a very great probability in our eyes, are, first, the general tendency of the book and the conclusion which all fair-minded readers must draw from it. The general tendency of the book, that which gives it charm and attraction in the reader's sight, is the beauty of the life of the real Christian characters introduced in it and the general hatefulness excited in them by the characters of infidels and Rationalists or worldly persons. Catharine, the real heroine of the book, is a charming character, not so much on account of her natural gifts, but because her life is the exemplification of a Christian who lives by faith. As a young girl, she accomplishes with scrupulous fidelity, earnestness and perseverance the difficult task imposed

upon her by her dying father—that of being a prop and a stay to her widowed mother, and of bringing up her sisters in the Christian faith and morality, and she adorns and fills this life-task with daily acts of most self-sacrificing benevolence. She is a model wife in spite of the great change which comes over her husband, and which is like the snapping of her very life, the ebbing away of her life-blood, filling her whole future life with unutterable anguish, trials which she bears with Christian fortitude and magnanimity, remaining true and faithful to her husband to the very end; but clinging more steadfastly and more tenaciously to her living Saviour and God.

Whatever beauty appears in the character of the hero himself, it comes to him inasmuch as he realizes the type of a Christian, both when a believer in the supernatural, as the rector of a parish, the originator and the centre of every humane and charitable deed, and when, having given up orthodox Christianity, he continues to be inspired by Christ, alas! in his darkened vision no longer God, but at least the best, the grandest, the sublimest human realization of purity of character and purpose, of justice and of goodness.

The characters in the novel representing modern infidelity and Rationalism are anything but attractive. And first, the squire, a bookworm, a half-crazy, intensely selfish man, who lets his tenantry be oppressed by a drunken brute of a steward, and who condescends to afford them some help and relief in their misery and wretchedness for no higher motive than to please the minister, whose faith he takes great delight in shaking and uprooting.

The next cynical character is Langham, another Rationalist and infidel, who, in order to indulge in his misanthropic habits, gives up his tutorship in Oxford and behaves as a selfish brute to a poor innocent girl who has foolishly condescended to notice him. Grey is another Rationalist, of the world, and rather of the nonentity style, practically speaking.

The other characters are of the common, worldly, everyday stamp of their class. Surely, if the authoress had intended to set off the Christian character in opposition to the infidel, and the result of the Christian faith in the lives of the real believer as contrasted with the effect of infidelity in the character of its upholders, with a view of emphasizing the saying of the Gospel, "from their fruit ye shall know them," she could not have written a better apology of orthodox Christianity.

That such must have been her intention appears also from the manner in which the upholders of Rationalism and their arguments are introduced. There is a hidden, silent, underlying something which steals upon the reader and gradually takes possession of him, that Christianity has not much to say for itself, and that

its historical evidence does not and cannot stand the test of criticism ; whereas, on the other hand, it seems to be taken for granted that the proof against it is not only complete and perfect, but absolutely invulnerable and unshaken. Mind you, you are not told so in any particular place, or in so many words, but the thing steals on you, and if you are not wide awake, takes possession of you. Here is a sample, taken at random :

Elsmere tells Langham that he intends to take orders and to preach. Langham answers :

" Well, after all," he said at last very slowly, " the difficulty lies in preaching anything. One may as well preach respectable mythology as anything else."

" What do you mean by mythology ?" asked Robert, hotly.

" Simply ideas or experiences personified (that is, ideas which are vested with all the individual circumstances of persons who have them). I take it they are the subject-matter of all theologies."

Robert answers and contends that Christian theology is a system of ideas made manifest in facts. Langham answers dryly, " How do you know they are facts ?"

The young man takes up the challenge and the conversation resolves itself into a discussion of Christian evidences. Or, rather, " Robert held forth and Langham kept him going by an occasional remark which acted like the prick of a spur. The tutor's psychological curiosity was soon satisfied. He declared to himself that the intellect had precious little to do with Elsmere's Christianity. He had got hold of all the stock apologetic arguments and used them, his companion admitted, with ability and ingenuity."

We are very much mistaken if such superciliousness on the part of Rationalists in treating the subject of Christian evidences, if such tone does not give the reader a decidedly mean idea of Christianity and of its proofs. Then look at the interlocutors. They are represented as prodigies of intellectual acumen and sharpness, as wonders of erudition and of application, as consummate scholars, as individual geniuses, before whom all must necessarily sink into insignificance. Here are some words which Elsmere addresses to the squire : " I think we ought to understand one another, perhaps, Mr. Wendover," Robert said, speaking under a quick sense of oppression, but with his usual dignity and bright courtesy. " I know your opinions, of course, from your book ; you know what mine, as an honest man, must be from the position I hold. My conscience does not forbid me to discuss anything, only *I am no match for you on points of scholarship*, and I should just like to say, once for all, that to me, whatever else is true, the religion of Christ is true."

In the conversation which gives the last blow to Robert's faith

in Christianity the same squire is introduced, and the defender of Christianity is, of course, only a young, liberal Catholic, a pale, small, hectic creature, the author of a remarkable collection of essays on mediæval subjects, a Mr. Wishart. The latter makes an extravagant remark which catches the squire's attention, and an argument is entered into which becomes for a moment a serious trial of strength. What was said on both sides is not told us by the authoress, but the result, of course, is in favor of the giant and against the puny young Catholic, and is seen by the woeful effect it has on Elsmere. "As the talk went on the rector in the background got paler and paler; his eyes, as they passed from the mobile face of the Catholic convert to the bronzed visage of the squire, got duller, more instinct with a slowly dawning despair."

Now we argue: certainly the authoress of the book, in the love of fair play, which is the boast of Englishmen, could not have seriously meant to have represented a real *bona fide* controversy between orthodox Christianity and Rationalism, and then placed all the advantage in the genius, ability, scholarship and experience of the persons engaged in it all on one side. She could not certainly have meant such a thing. She knew, of course, that when in a supposed controversy the advantage is all on one side, the other side's case must necessarily remain invulnerable and unassailable in the eyes of all honest men.

But what may really prove our guess to be correct, that our authoress meant to make an argument, *ex absurdis*, in favor of Christianity, is the necessarily weak nature of the reasons and grounds which are alleged by Rationalists against the evidences of Christianity, and which she puts and arranges with infinite skill and address. It is these arguments which shook the faith of Elsmere and caused it to totter and to fall that we intend to examine, not that they are anything new to scholars or theologians, but because they may have some show of power over minds that are untrained and unskilled in these matters, or on readers who pass too carelessly over a book and are unfit to pause and ponder over assertions which are made so categorically and which appear to be serious and to be fraught with some real meaning and import.

To facilitate the understanding of the subject, we may remark that Christianity, being a system of truths embodied and incorporated in a series of facts, must necessarily depend, as to its truth or falsehood, upon the value which is attached to such facts, and these in their turn upon the reliableness of human testimony, and must stand or fall as human testimony is proven to stand or to fall. For instance, the resurrection of our Blessed Lord is a fact which depends on the reliability of the source from which we have it, those who stand up as witnesses of the supposed fact. Hence the

truth or falsehood of the series of facts upon which Christianity rests, which make up, as it were, the whole Christianity, depends on two questions. The first is: What is the value of human testimony in general? The second is: Are the facts of Christianity really supported by reliable and trustworthy testimony? The first is the general thesis, the second is the application of the thesis to a particular order of facts. Our readers can see that the whole question here depends on the answer to the first problem: What is the value of human testimony? Because, if no value is attached to such testimony, all the facts depending and resting upon its trustworthiness must fall to the ground. Now, in the book which we are criticizing, all the efforts are directed against the general thesis, in shaking or explaining away the reliableness of human testimony, and the attack which rebounds on Christianity from such efforts must have its consequence on the whole science of history. The attack is prepared most skilfully. In page 222 (Hurst & Co., N. Y.) Elsmere having told Langham that he is thinking of writing a historical book, the latter says: "There is one thing that doesn't seem to have touched you yet, but you will come to it. To my mind it makes almost the chief interest of history. It is just this: History depends on testimony. What is the nature and the value of testimony at given times? In other words, did the man of the third century understand, or report, or interpret facts in the same way as the man of the sixteenth or the nineteenth? And if not, what are the differences and what the deductions to be made from them, if any?"

Elsmere answers: "It is enormously important, I grant—enormously," he repeated reflectively.

"I should think it is," said Langham to himself as he rose, "the whole of orthodox Christianity is in it, for instance."

Here the thesis is clearly stated in its general sense, though Elsmere does not fully realize its import, according to the general system of our authoress in representing the Christian disputants as always of a mental capacity much inferior to that of the opponents of Revelation.

But in the second part of the book, page 350, the meaning of the question is more fully explained. "Testimony," says Mr. Wendover, "like every other human product, has developed man's power of apprehending and recording what he sees and hears, has grown from less to more, from weaker to stronger, like any other of his faculties, just as the reasoning powers of the cave-dwellers have developed into the reasoning powers of a Kant."

Let us examine carefully the above statements, after trying to define the exact meaning of the authoress, who has thrown a very great amount of confusion into them, whether purposely or from

want of skill in handling philosophical subjects, we cannot very well decide.

First, it is affirmed that man's power of apprehending and recording what he sees and hears has grown from less to more, from weaker to stronger.

The object of such apprehending and recording seems to be very clearly pointed out, and yet it is not so. What one sees certainly appertains to an outward, external, sensible object. But what one hears does not necessarily imply a sensible object, because one may listen to a discussion of the highest metaphysical subjects and, if not well trained in such things, may not apprehend their import.

Then there is a great difference, as regards truth and evidence, between what one himself sees and what he may hear from others. What one sees himself is evidenced to him by the testimony of his own eyes, whereas the truth and reliableness of what he hears depend on the knowledge and the veracity of the narrator.

Again, there is a wide difference between apprehending what one sees and recording it. One may be in every way competent to see and ascertain an event, and yet may not be able to properly record it.

All these different questions, therefore, should not be confounded together, but should be treated separately, speaking first of the power of apprehending what one sees and afterwards of the others. Now, this power is asserted by the squire to be progressive from less to more, as the powers of a cave-dweller have been developed into those of Kant. We have not such exalted ideas of the reasoning powers of the latter philosopher as our authoress. We consider him as not much better than a skeptic and a sophist; and hence the contrast must necessarily lose upon our mind that force which our gifted authoress intended. We decline, also, to have anything to do with cave-dwellers or any such mysterious people, about whom neither the authoress nor we do know, or can know, very much.

Limiting, then, our problem to outward, sensible facts, such as can be the object of our senses, and especially the eyes, and confining our inquiry to civilized times, we may put the question—Is it true that man's power of apprehending what he sees has grown from less to more, from weaker to stronger?

Reason and common sense must give a flat and unqualified denial to such a question. The reason is as simple as it is undeniable. The eye of man was as good nineteen centuries ago as it is at the present day; and if the object which it was to behold was an outward, external, sensible fact, we cannot make out any reason why it could not have seen it to its heart's content then as it can

now ; and why it could not place as much reliance on itself then as it does at present, the organ of vision being the same and the objects of a sensible nature, the relation between the organ and its object must be the same at all times and in all places. The testimony of man's eyes, then, cannot be subject to variation or progress from less to more, from weaker to stronger. Given all the conditions exacted by optics to realize the vision of an object, the testimony of the eye must be always the same, uniform, stable and unchangeable.

We deny, then, that the testimony of the eye is variable and progressive and relative to time and space, both as to the faculty of observing and as to the reliability of its observation ; and the eye-witnesses of the early period of Christianity are entitled to the same confidence as the eyes of any or of all Rationalists put together, provided that the two conditions which are absolutely necessary to render human testimony a criterion of truth be verified.

These conditions, as every one knows, are, first, that the witnesses have really, unmistakably, and without any fear of deception, observed the facts for which they vouch, and have acquired a subjective certainty about them. Secondly, that they state them truthfully and under such circumstances as to render any conspiracy for deception on their part utterly impossible.

We are using the plural number, witnesses, because, though it might be contended, as it has been by some, that one witness is entitled to perfect confidence when those two conditions are realized, yet, to avoid all possible difficulty, we require for the absolute reliableness of human testimony a number of eye-witnesses ; because all human testimony, necessarily and originally, must start from those who have themselves observed the facts.

There are infallible rules to ascertain when those two conditions have been complied with, and once that has been ascertained human testimony takes its rank among the criteria of truth, and must create a certainty about the facts it testifies to. The reason is, that if there could be a deception in such case, it would reflect upon God, the Creator and Ruler of the human family. If man is a social being, if he must live in society and fellowship with other men, if such society is realized principally in a mutual interchange of ideas, of facts, of confidence and reliance, if all this is not limited to one generation of men, but embraces all generations, at all times and in all places, one generation handing over to the following generation the whole patrimony it received from a former one, together with the addition it has itself made, and this to another, it stands to reason that if human testimony, even when properly examined and sifted in every possible way, were open to

mistake, to error, to deception, the bond keeping human society together would be dissolved, there would no longer be a human family, the design of the Creator would miserably and wretchedly fail. We should then give up all historical certainty, we should abolish all possible intercourse among men, and fall back upon the savage and misanthropic state.

We will not dwell at any great length upon the other two questions, whether the power of apprehending and recording what one hears is variable or not. Those two questions depend upon the first, as all human testimony must of necessity fall back upon the eye-witness. Because, in order to yield our assent to what we hear, or to what certain records may testify, it is absolutely necessary to carefully and closely examine on what grounds the statements rest which we are called upon to believe; and if, after the proper examination and the most scrupulous inquiry, they turn out to be reliable and worthy of our confidence, it shall be found that they are supported by the testimony of eye-witnesses who were neither deceived themselves nor disposed to deceive others, and could not do it even if so inclined.

Human testimony, therefore, in the last analysis resolves itself into that of the eye-witness, and it is and can be neither relative to time or place, nor progressive when its object is an outward, sensible, public fact; and when accompanied with those two conditions spoken of, it is a perfectly reliable criterion of truth.

But our authoress by her mouth-piece, the Squire, insists that it is progressive, and that it can be proven to be so by history and experience, and it is our duty to listen to the proof. "What one wants is the ordered proof of this, and it can be got from history and experience." And to pave the way for such a proof, we are told that "to plunge into the Christian period, without having first cleared the mind as to what is meant in history and literature by the critical method, is to invite fiasco."

We might demur against such condition, and insist on being satisfied with examining the credibility of human testimony according to reason or common sense, because either the critical method is founded on reason and common sense, and then it must be all the same to the authoress; or it is not supported by those two requisites for a man to find out the truth, and then it ought to be spurned as worthless. But we will be over-indulgent for the time being, and study this great bug-bear in history and literature—the critical method.

Pray, what is the critical method in history and literature? "In history it is the science of what is credible, in literature it is the science of what is rational." We begin to acquire some kind of respect for the critical method, for it promises wondrous things,

yet we must request a little more light and beg of it to explain what is credible and what is rational, because without that explanation we are pretty much where we were before. Well, then, what is credible and what is rational?

We presume that none will dispute that a method is the manner of doing a thing, or of inquiring into a subject, according to certain rules derived from principles applicable to the thing to be done or to the matter to be inquired into. In every method, therefore, there is a process directed by certain rules which are drawn from certain principles applicable to the matter in hand. How is a naturalist, for instance, to proceed in the investigation of some natural phenomenon? What method shall he follow? Surely the method of observation, which prescribes certain rules to be complied with: 1st. a careful examination of the phenomenon by every experiment in his power, first by sight and other senses, then by means of instruments, the best adapted for the investigation, then to confirm his results by experiment in the inverse ratio when possible, and so forth.

These rules are founded upon certain principles which any one may guess. Method, then, depends on rules, and rules originate in principles. The critical method, to usurp such a pompous title, must then proceed from certain rules in the investigation of its object, and these must be derived from certain principles applicable to and bearing upon the subject. It undertakes to give us rules to find out what is credible and what is rational. It must then have the monopoly of knowing what is credible and what is rational.

How did it come by such a monopoly? Who gave it such an exclusive right? Where are the documents to prove it? Such a claim, as the supporters of the critical method urge, is the very climax and sublimity of pretension. They set themselves up to teach mankind what is credible and what is incredible, what is rational and what is irrational, and assume in consequence of this modest claim that all such as prove restive to submit to such despotism and insolence are very low in the scale of intelligence, simply dupes, ready to gulp down any amount of the veriest trash and rubbish. See how disparaging and contemptuously Mr. Wendover speaks of these: "The theologian in such a state (that is, who has not cleared his mind by the critical method) sees no obstacle to accepting any arbitrary (?) list of documents, with all the strange stuff they may contain, and declaring them to be sound historical material, whilst he applies to all the strange stuff they may contain of a similar kind surrounding them the most vigorous principles of modern science." What proof has Mr. Wendover for

all this? None whatever, except that it must be so because the theologians have not cleared their minds with the critical method. What is this but silly and extravagant impertinence, not to be tolerated if said of any other class of persons, but admissible because applied to Christian historians and theologians?

The secret of these critics and of their method is that they want you to lay down as an absolutely certain and infallible principle, that whatever in history may savor of supernatural, miraculous, super-intelligible, must be discarded *a priori*, handled without gloves or consideration, rejected, eliminated, spurned with utter contempt, and ranked among the incredible and the irrational and the absurd. It is then and not till then that they allow you to examine with a clear mind the historical documents in favor of Christianity.

The rules they assign are of a piece, and in perfect conformity with such principle. Let us see. "Suppose," says Mr. Wendover, "before I begin to deal with the Christian story and the earliest Christian development, I try to make out beforehand what are the moulds, the channels into which the testimony of the time must run. I look for these moulds, of course, in the dominant ideas, the intellectual pre-conceptions and pre-occupations existing when the period begins." It seems, then, that the first rule of the critical method is to interpret testimony by the mould and channels into which it must run, and these are to be found in the dominant ideas of the period.

We have much to say on this rule. First, is it founded on reason? Mark well that we are talking of testimony as to outward, sensible, public facts, and not of opinions to be passed upon them. If it were a question of passing an opinion upon certain facts, the pre-conceived ideas and pre-occupations in the mind of those who are to pass such judgment might influence, mould, or modify that opinion. But the question is as to verifying and testifying to a fact. An event occurs, it takes place in daylight, in public, in the market-place, hundreds can see and touch it, so to speak. What have the ideas, pre-conceptions and pre-occupations of the spectators got to do with the mere ascertaining of that event which passes under their own observation? Can they, as honest men, proclaim that they don't see what is staring them in the face because they may happen to have some ideas and pre-conceptions? Can they stultify themselves and refuse to yield to the testimony of their senses? If, then, the ascertaining of a sensible public fact has no connection whatever with the ideas and bias of the mind of the spectators, the rule is false.

In the second place, suppose that an event must be interpreted, qualified, limited according to the ideas and pre-conceptions of

those who verify and testify to it, what then? Does that necessarily shake the force of that testimony? It may or may not; the decision depends on whether those ideas and pre-conceptions be true or false. If they be true, the testimony will receive strength by the channel into which it runs. If they be false, the testimony may be affected by the falsity of the medium. The rule, then, even if allowed, would prove naught against Christian testimony, unless it was demonstrated, not by assumptions and arbitrary statements, but by positive proofs, that the ideas and pre-conceptions and pre-occupations of the spectators and witnesses of the facts were false and untenable.

Again, the rule must work both ways; it must apply to the early Christian witnesses, when the Christian period began, as well as to our sublime critics of the present day. The ideas, pre-conceptions and pre-occupations of the latter are dead set against anything supernatural, wonderful, miraculous, above and beyond the grossest materialism; such pre-conceptions against all that takes the shape and form of the most intense and enraged hatred and contempt; such ideas, pre-conceptions and pre-occupations have not even the shadow of reason or proof, but are assumed, *a priori*, without discussion, without admitting even the possibility of the contrary; and upon those ideas is proclaimed what is credible and what is rational. How, then, can any reasonable man expect that Christianity will consider such critics fit to examine and to judge its historical documents and proofs? Therefore, by applying their own rule to these methodic critics, we have a right to pronounce them as utterly and absolutely incompetent to judge of Christian history and Christian testimony.

But to proceed. Is it true that the ideas and pre-conceptions of the world when the Christian period began were in favor of Christianity beyond a general belief in the supernatural, which is the instinctive feeling of human nature, and the expression of which is signalled at all times and in all places? That is what Mr. Wendover asserts, and that is what the craven ignoramus, the Rev. Robert Elsmere, allowed to pass without a remark.

"In the first place," says the Squire, "I shall find present in the age which saw the birth of Christianity, as in so many other ages, a universal pre-conception in favor of miracles, that is to say, of deviation from common norm of experience governing the work of all men and of all schools. Very well, allow for it then."

The reverend gentleman might have replied: "On your own assertion, sir, the miracle is a universal pre-conception, not only of that age, but of many other ages." Does it not, then, occur to you that belief in the supernatural and the miraculous may be the

common patrimony of mankind? And is it not also at the present time the universal belief of mankind, with the exception of the few great geniuses, bold spirits, the would-be *élite* of the world, those who are led by the critical method? Besides, he could have asked, is such a belief true or false? If it be true, it matters very little whether the witnesses at the dawn of Christianity were inclined to such a belief or not. And have critics and philosophers and scientists ever furnished the slightest proof that it is false? Does not the sum total of their proof amount to this—that, given the principle that everything miraculous must be rejected, we proclaim the history of Christianity of no value whatever?

Besides, he might have added, we deny absolutely that the world at the beginning of Christianity was in any particular way inclined to or biassed in favor of the miracle and the supernatural beyond the common universal belief and craving of mankind in and after some supernatural union and intercourse with the Divinity. He could easily have proved that from the leading historical facts of those days. And it would have been in vain for the Squire to contradict him and to cry out: "The wonder would have been to have had a life of Christ without miracles. The air teems with them. The East is full of Messiahs. Even Tacitus is superstitious. Even Vespasian works miracles. Even a Nero cannot die, but fifty years after his death is still looked for as the inaugurator of a millennium of horror." We say it would have been useless for the Squire to allege such things as a predisposition of the Jewish and the Roman world in favor of Christianity, because he ought to have known that the religious pre-conceptions of the Jews and the Paganism of the Romans were the greatest and the most powerful antagonists Christianity had to cope with, and if it came victorious from the fight it was only after meeting and encountering three centuries of the fiercest and most furious attacks, and after shedding the heart's blood of millions of her pontiffs and of her children. Whatever religious ideas, then, pre-conceptions, pre-occupations in favor of the miraculous and the supernatural existed among the Jewish and Pagan nations, they were all used against, not in favor of, Christianity; and the mould and the channel into which Christian testimony had to run were among the fiercest and the worst of her foes.

This remark disposes also of the pre-conceptions flowing from the pre-Christian apocalyptic literature of the Jews, because all these served as so many tools and weapons against Christianity.

Mr. Elsmere lets another great blunder pass without any observation. The Squire condescends to give the definition of miracle. "Miracle, that is, deviation from the common norm of

experience governing the work of all men and of all schools." The definition is somewhat ambiguous. Does Mr. Wendover mean that a miracle is the deviation of the common norm of experience, inasmuch as it does not, and cannot be, the subject of the ordinary observation of men? If such be his meaning, as we suspect, he is sadly mistaken.

The miracle is an outward sensible fact subject to the observation of our senses, the same, in every respect, as a natural, *bona fide* phenomenon or event. Take any miracle recorded in the Gospel, say, for instance, the restoring to life of the son of the widow of Naim. Our Lord happens to be walking in the public way followed by His disciples. They reach the gate of the city. A funeral passes by. The only son of a widowed mother is being carried to the grave; a great number of friends and acquaintances accompany the bier where the remains of the young man lie. So far everything is natural, there is or can be no deviation from the common norm of experience; the large multitude of people see the bier, behold the remains of the dead, and sympathize with the poor mother, and see our Lord approach and touch the bier, and those who carry it come to a stop. The next thing they hear is our Lord uttering those solemn words, "Young man, I say to thee, arise." Immediately after these words, to their great astonishment, they see him who was dead sit up, and hear him speak, and with the help of our Lord leap from the bier and run up to his mother.

Pray, where is the deviation from the common norm of experience? What is strange about it? The young man being alive is a fact ascertainable by the same senses which observed him dead, his sitting up in the bier in obedience to the omnipotent voice of Christ, his talking, his leaping down from the bier, his standing strong and erect before that multitude of spectators, his running to embrace his mother, are the continuation of the same fact falling under the observation of the same faculties. Where is the difference, the departure from the common norm of experience? And we beg to remark that this is in perfect conformity with the common rule commanding the work of all men and of all schools. They observe an event, a fact, a natural phenomenon, and they conclude a law; but the fact is observed by the senses; it is reason which argues the law. The senses in the spectators of a miracle observe a sensible fact, an event which, inasmuch as it falls within the province of the senses, is as much a fact as any other in the universe; and the senses know and can know nothing of the agency which has produced it; this is supplied by the reason of the spectators who observe the fact. The reverend gentleman letting such a blunder pass unnoticed gives evidence that he knew nothing about miracles any more than Mr. Wendover himself.

What remains of the harangue of the Squire is of a piece with the premises. "Be prepared for the inevitable differences between it and the testimony of our own day." The difference exists only in the fertile brain of the skeptic. "The witness of the time is not true, nor in a strict sense false. It is merely incompetent, half-trained, but all through perfectly natural." Having demonstrated that to be a thoroughly competent witness, it is not necessary to belong to the self-appointed critical club of the gentlemen who reject *a priori*, all which does not square with their ideas and preconceptions; the evident conclusion must be that the early Christian testimony is supported by perfectly qualified witnesses.

Before closing up our remark we wish to notice the following words of the harangue: "The resurrection is partly invented, partly imagined, partly ideally true, in any case wholly intelligible and natural as a product of the age, when once you have the key of that age."

We have proved that it is not at all necessary to use that key so kindly and so officiously furnished by the Squire. We have proved, moreover, that after all the key may be the right one, and instead of explaining away the facts may only confirm them more and more; that it was the business of Mr. Wendover, and of all un-Christian, rationalistic, infidel critics to prove first that key to be a false one, a thing which they do not as much as dream of doing. On what ground, then, do they conclude with the Squire: "The resurrection is partly invented, partly imagined, partly ideally true." Why not say at once it is absolutely and wretchedly false?

A fact of such immense importance, which is attested by a number of witnesses in the full and complete possession of their senses, witnesses stubbornly set against it; a fact, the observation and verification of which are repeated again and again, now by the apostles and then by the disciples, once by as many as five hundred in number; a fact which one of the witnesses stubbornly declared he would never believe unless he could see it with his own eyes and touch with his own hands, both of which things he had ample opportunity of doing; a fact which was never denied by those who had every possible reason to do so, the whole Jewish priesthood, all the Sanhedrim, the sects, Sadducees, Pharisees, Herodians, the whole Jewish people; a fact admitted indirectly by the very soldiery who kept watch over the sepulchre, and who, following the suggestion of the Jews, gave out that whilst they were asleep the Apostles had come and stolen the body away, a suggestion which called forth that celebrated stricture of St. Augustine to the Jews: "Do you make use of sleeping witnesses?" a fact attested by the Apostles after they had become convinced of

it by repeated observations at the expense of everything that a man holds dear, and confirmed and sealed by their blood; a fact which has been examined, scrutinized, sifted, and found unattackable and invulnerable by nineteen centuries of Christian genius, and for the truth of which millions of Christians have shed their blood; a fact which, as soon as proclaimed, produced a moral revolution in the universe and created Christian civilization; a fact on which the Christian Church has been founded, propagated, and continues to live and to resist and survive all the attacks of her enemies; such a fact, we beg the authoress's pardon, cannot be disposed of so summarily and so cavalierly by a few words put in the mouth of a half-crazy squire who ends his days by his own hand in a fit of insanity. It is the very acme of impertinent and impudent self-conceit.

We may be right after all in the guess we ventured to make in the beginning of our article, that the authoress, in the production of her novel, intended to make in favor of Christianity one of those arguments called *ex absurdo*, putting in bold relief the flimsiness of the web of the rationalistic argument by showing in the happiest manner possible how it lacks the very pretext of a reasonable foundation, and by emphasizing their modest and shrinking pretensions to be possessed of the exclusive right to know and to teach what is credible and what is rational under the penalty for any transgressor of losing caste, and "falling *ipso facto* out of court with men of education."—(Page 351.)

THE PAPACY AS AN INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNAL.

1. *Le Tribunal International*, par le Comte L. Kamarowsky, professeur de droit international à l'Université de Moscou; précédé d'une *Introduction* par Jules Lacointa, ancien Avocat Général à la Cour de Cassation, professeur de droit des gens à l'Institut Catholique de Paris, etc.
2. *Conférence Internationale de la Croix Rouge à Genève*. Discours prononcé le 2 Septembre, 1884, par Jules Lacointa.
3. *Le dernier projet de Code Pénal Italien*. Lettre à M. Zanardelli, Garde des Sceaux, etc., du Royaume d'Italie, par Jules Lacointa. 1888.
4. *La Magistrature et la Crise Judiciaire*, par Jules Lacointa. 1880.

NO question has occupied, in our century, the attention of statesmen and jurists, or has been discussed by legislators and journalists, that surpasses or even equals in practical importance the subject treated of by Count Kamarowsky, in his masterly work, "Le Tribunal International," and completed by the most eminent of French jurists, Jules Lacointa, in the no less masterly "Introduction" written for the Paris edition. Let us deal with this "Introduction," in the first place; the horizons it opens up, the lofty principles it vindicates, and the practical considerations it urges upon governments and peoples, will prepare us to understand and appreciate the mighty import of Count Kamarowsky's treatise.

I.

The manifold costliness of the twelve millions of armed men kept on foot by the European nations; the intolerable burdens imposed on the tax-payers; the entire youth and manhood of so many countries taken away from domestic life and the walks of the most needful and profitable industry; the hoarded wealth of what was once Christendom, and all the resources of the most advanced science, applied to the discovery and use of the most destructive agencies and implements, and the black war-cloud which now hangs over Europe, continental and insular, pregnant with the ruin of empires and the death of millions of human beings;—all this pleads for PEACE and for the recognition of a mediator and arbiter between nations clothed with the authority of the divine "Prince of Peace."

The terrifying vision of danger to her supremacy is frightening

Great Britain into creating a new navy. Is it not the resolve to avert possible war from our own borders which stimulates our Government and Congress to erect sea-coast defences, and to have the American flag borne on every sea by armed vessels, powerful enough and numerous enough to render peace certain in our free and prosperous country, by making war a very remote possibility?

It is well that among a people who have no rivals to fear on the American continent, and who have no ambition to enlarge the magnificent patrimony Providence has given them, there should spring up those associations which aim to do away with war and to secure peace, blessed and permanent peace, to the human family.

"One cannot do too much," says M. Lacointa, "to render war less cruel and of less frequent occurrence. All that can be taken away from war is a gift toward the prosperity of states, the vitality and fortune of nations.

"If man is powerless to stop this plague altogether, it concerns him to lessen its fearful effects. It would be much to prevent frequently the recourse to arms, to exhaust, in order to prevent it, all the means of arriving at a peaceful solution.

"Law-suits between private persons are, generally, only authorized after having tried conciliation; it should be the same between states. When private dissensions arise, people do not rush to take up arms; in such cases violence is forbidden; courts are established to decide on the cause of quarrel. Why, then, should violence, instead of being a rare exception, become the principal form of terminating international disputes? Because there is no judge between states; the absence of a superior authority leaves, all too often, no other issue but hostilities."

This is the generative idea of the joint work of Count Kamarsowsky and M. Lacointa; indeed, we may say, it was this need of "a Judge between States," of "a Superior Authority," recognized as arbiter by the entire civilized world, that set men's minds a-thinking on both sides of the Atlantic, and gave rise, directly or indirectly, to all the "Peace Congresses" assembled in our day.

Nor, as we shall see, have these peace congresses and associations borne no solid nor salutary fruit.

M. Lacointa glances at the various institutions, both among ancient and modern peoples, established to prevent the frequent and unnecessary recurrence of wars. The persons charged with pronouncing on such a necessity were always judged to be "most enlightened." In ancient Rome, the college of *Feciales* had to be consulted before war was either decided on or declared. This precaution won the approval of Cicero as well as the warm admiration of Bossuet. "It was a holy institution," said the latter, "which reflects shame on Christians, to whom a God came down

on earth to pacify all things, but has been unable to inspire with sentiments of charity and peace."

In our day, when so long a period of centuries separates Christendom from barbaric times, there is, M. Lacointa justly complains, no sufficient safeguard for securing against destruction and ruin the lives of men and the fortunes of states and citizens.

Is the killing of men in battle a lawful act when the war is an unjust one?

"We do not say, whatever may be the authority of those who maintain the contrary opinion, that no soldier should obey or take any part in the hostilities until a regular decision from a specially competent authority had acknowledged that the war was a rightful one. The duty of obeying one's superior officers, especially in presence of the enemy, is one that may not be discussed. With this reserve, however, and examining the question under the highest social point of view, we ask, ought there not to be judges charged with the responsibility of pronouncing on the *necessity* of taking up arms, *necessitas, non voluntas* ('the *necessity*, not the *will*'), according to the firm declaration of St. Augustine, the *will* being ever disposed toward peace, *necessity* alone compelling to make war?"

Certainly, if a preliminary deliberation, such as that ordered by the *jus feciale* in Pagan Rome, was an acknowledged legal condition toward a declaration of war among Christian peoples, we should have regained a most precious advantage.

"That peoples, growing daily more jealous of their independence, leave it exclusively in the power either of a political assembly or of a sovereign, subject to the influence of all sorts of excitement, the faculty of declaring war without calling to their aid the advice of competent and dispassionate counsellors; that men so wedded to and greedy of liberties often superfluous and of no account should show themselves so reckless of the dearest interests of the family and the nation, is sufficient to astonish and bewilder the most skeptical observer."

Have we Americans not had a bitter experience of such utter recklessness, such unaccountable folly, in the long series of disputes which led to the war of Secession and in the criminal rashness which precipitated us into the first hostilities?

Contrast this inconsistent and irrational mode of proceeding, so prevalent among nations professing to be guided by the maxims of the Gospel, with the practice of the Moslem world. "Not any more than the Consuls and the Senate in Rome," says M. Lacointa, "can the Sultan or his Divan in Constantinople decide by themselves on declaring war (that is, an *offensive* war). Every soldier knows, in Turkey, that unless the College of *Ulemas* has delib-

erated and issued the *fetva* authorizing the war, he cannot unsheathe his sword. Should he do so otherwise, the ministers of his religion will refuse him burial in consecrated ground, and he will be, according to the Moslem belief, doomed to eternal damnation. Hostilities may not be begun without this authorization, just as they might not in ancient Rome before the decision of the *Feciales*; else, the Sultan would not be obeyed. The *fetva* has to be published from the top of the minarets and the *Imans* read it in front of the armed battalions."

M. Lacointa, in the absence of a like recognized authority among Christian nations at the present moment, mentions with praise the field instructions issued to the Federal armies during our civil war and the neutralization of ambulances and the inviolableness of wounded soldiers proclaimed in the Convention of Geneva, as well as the prohibition of explosive bullets by the Convention of St. Petersburg. This last step was taken at the suggestion of the Emperor Alexander II., who also, six years afterward, encouraged the meeting of the Conference of Brussels to discuss the laws and usages of modern warfare, the better treatment of military prisoners, a more religious respect for private property on land, and a mitigation of the hardships to which private fortunes are exposed on sea in time of war. All these are partial successes marking the long struggle of justice against violence.

But all these are only temporary expedients, like most of the means for preventing war advocated by Count Kamarowsky, such as *negotiation, kindly offices, mediation, conferences, and congresses.*

In the Divine plan of which the Church and the political constitution of the Christendom created by the Church were to be the realization, there was one Central Authority, essentially mediatorial and peace-making, which fulfilled, so long as Christendom remained united, the office of judge and arbiter between the nations. That this divinely-instituted Central Authority did not effect more toward preventing wars and their consequences throughout the early and middle ages was due to the very nature of the dominant feudalism. It did, however, much more than its greatest admirers have claimed, and, as it is to last through all time, Providence will so direct events as to make rulers and peoples once more look up to its mediation and judgment as to the sole divinely-appointed remedy against the evils of warfare.

But it will interest the reader to hear upon this very point a man who stood in France at the head of his noble profession before conscience and honor bade him descend from his high seat in the magistracy.

"In the Middle Ages Europe possessed an arbitrator to whom, as everybody acknowledges, the nations were indebted for signal

services. The Popes, accepted as magistrates placed over kings and peoples, interposed their authority on many occasions and effected a pacification. In the centre of Christendom was seated a living oracle who decided without appeal on disputes. Law-giver and supreme judge, he restrained feudal anarchy and violence. *The Peace of God* powerfully aided him in his efforts. The spiritual unity of the Church, which had become the mediator among nations, contributed toward founding on the ruins of the Roman world the new society in whose bosom was developed the general concert of states.

"It was no vulgar ambition that inspired Gregory VII. and Innocent III. Whatever opinion one may hold about their aspirations, and how impossible soever of being realized one may judge them to be, there is no denying the grandeur of the conception which led them to undertake their reforms. Under the ascendancy of the head of religion, whose authority was ever on the increase, a Christian international law sprang up, to which a fresh impulse was given by the crusades, the expansive progress of commerce, the propagation of the principles of the law of nature by the teaching of Roman law,—a legacy of the ancient city,—by the discovery, in fine, of the New World. Canon law enunciated axioms adopted by the public law of modern times; celebrated theologians were the first to write treatises on war, aiming to soften the savage rudeness of camps and to condemn their licentiousness; and from their works modern writers on military matters borrow many useful suggestions.

"The rule of the Papacy, which so often compelled Might to acknowledge the pre-eminence of Right, manifested in international relations its spiritualizing and pacifying influence. The Bull so often discussed, which at the end of the fifteenth century defined the boundaries of the immense discoveries of the Spaniards and Portuguese, was a confession made by the nations who demanded it that mere conquest did not suffice (to bestow the right of possession), and a petition, not for concessions which no one could grant, but for a sanction emanating from the highest representative of Right."

These truths, borrowed alike from authentic history and from the highest theological sources, are needful in our day, not only to the statesman, the diplomat, the legislator and enlightened politician, but to all who make the law their profession. If what was once Christendom has been divided by criminal political ambition and by false teaching, this has been due to the impious setting aside of the Papal authority; and if what remains of the once glorious unity is to be saved from the hands of the anti-Christian conspirators of our day, we must all labor to restore to the Papacy its practical

authority, its international influence, its independence, and all the salutary prerogatives of its mediatorial and judicial office.

The return of governments and nations to the old paths from which they have strayed must naturally be a slow one; but it has already begun. It is hard for proud and prosperous peoples to acknowledge that, in an evil hour, they wilfully closed their eyes to one of those fundamental social truths which are in the designs of the King of Kings to be beacon-lights for the guidance of humanity. But they are once more turning their faces toward the unquenchable radiance ever falling from the Seven Hills of Rome.

"A tribunal of public peace has been an object of desire during the last centuries to thinkers whose works are well known. This tribunal does not, indeed, exist at the present moment; but the wish that it should exist is more urgently, more frequently, expressed now than at any period in the past."

ARBITRATION, so often employed within the present century, is only a step, and it is a great one, toward the creation of the desired International Tribunal. M. Lacointa anticipates Count Kamarowsky's recital in a brief enumeration of the most remarkable acts of arbitration recorded, from the treaty concluded November 19th, 1794, between the United States and Great Britain, down to the *Alabama* arbitration.

He mentions the Senate Bill of June, 1886, authorizing the President of the United States to invite Mexico, together with all the states of Central and South America, to meet in Congress and discuss the best means of settling among themselves all differences that may arise.

"The successes attending the method of arbitration mark a decisive stage in the ascending march of law. The experience thus acquired attracts other states; not a year passes without the establishment of commissions or arbitration courts to solve questions the most diversified. The multiplicity of relations between peoples has made this development necessary."

A striking fact, mentioned by M. Lacointa, is that although there does not exist among sovereign and independent states any means of compelling the carrying out of an arbitral decision, nevertheless not one of the sentences thus pronounced has remained without complete fulfilment. Much, for instance, as Great Britain felt disappointed and aggrieved by the sentence of the arbitration court regarding the *Alabama* claims, that sentence was executed.

Another no less remarkable step on the road toward a peaceful settlement of international difficulties, is the custom now fairly established of introducing into all treaties what is known as the *compromissory clause*, the *compromissum* being the promise made by

each of the contracting parties to refer all differences arising about the interpretation or execution of the treaty to an arbitrator.

This led to the creating in Berne, the capital of the Swiss Confederacy, of *permanent offices*, whose business is to arbitrate in difficulties arising out of various branches of international activity.

The truth is that there is some danger of making too common a use of arbitration, which should only be invoked in difficulties of the most momentous kind. Still the bonds which are daily bringing more closely together the peoples most widely separated from each other by geographical space, by race, religion, and social institutions, multiply in every direction industrial activity, commercial and political relations, and increase in the same ratio the necessity of a well-developed and defined international jurisprudence. And, of course, the crowning of the edifice of international law must be a court to interpret and apply it.

We have only to remember how many additions have been made of late years to the legislation and institutions which are properly called international.

Our American authors have long been clamoring for the protection of an international copyright law, while our American publishers, who are a great money-power, are equally determined that our authors shall not have it. Such a law, putting authors on a footing of equality with their brethren in Europe, would be no small boon. Then there are international laws protecting industry and trade-marks; international postal conventions. And soon, some people hope, international telegraphs, railways, and other means of transport, will enjoy the protection of like common laws.

So, the more one reflects on this subject, the wider grows the prospect of close and manifold social and commercial relations between the inhabitants of our globe, the more also increases the conviction that all the dangers which threaten the peace of the world can only be effectively and permanently removed by the recognition of the mediatorial and arbitral authority of the Vicar on earth of Him who is the Judge of the whole earth.

"The Law of Nations exists, therefore," says M. Lacointa; "it is written in the treatises and works of publicists, or (and this is its first code) written in the conscience and the customs of generations. Its manifestations are frequent. Arbitrators, chosen by accident, apply it on various occasions. Without being supported by coercive means, their sentences are always executed. Why, then, should not a court, with a wider or narrower jurisdiction, be established to preside permanently over the execution of this law by the various states?"

Speaking of the agencies which have gradually and most powerfully so moulded public opinion as to make the peoples of both

hemispheres adverse to war and desirous of peaceful arbitration, M. Lacointa mentions, in the first place, the societies, unions, leagues, and friends of PEACE, who, under one form or one name or another, have been working so hard and so long to bring mankind to wish for *peace unbroken and perpetual*.

We, who have grown old with the century, can well remember how these "Friends of Peace" were laughed at as mere visionaries. They used to be looked down upon with somewhat of the same pity we extended to the Millerites and Millennium craze in general.

"When once you utter the word *chimæra*, *utopia*, all discussion becomes impossible, the case is ended, the verdict given in, and the idea is condemned. And this is so true that, fearful of being blamed as utopians, many persons will not even look at the pre-judged question. We all know what power there is in certain words. But are not hasty condemnations as arbitrary as blind prejudice or a foregone conclusion not to examine a question?"

"I am free to confess it," says M. Lacointa, "the creation of *an international tribunal* did appear to me as a *chimæra*, and, though strongly drawn to that order of studies, when I read Count Kamarowsky's book, I thought it a very rash production; and had it been in my power to do so, I should have willingly modified it.

"An attentive examination, meditation on the subject matter, have done away with that impression. The title is a bold one, no doubt, but it is no longer blame-worthy in my eyes. I see in it the formula of a just idea, which the future, which time, the incomparable master, can make a practical idea."

To the societies devoted to the pursuit of *international arbitration*, and their persevering efforts, the civilized world is indebted for this mode of settling difficulties between states. Both the British Parliament and the American Congress, after resisting the propositions made for adopting this solution, ended by approving it; our Congress declared this way of settling quarrels to be equitable and practical.

Charles Sumner, Richard Cobden, and Henry Richard, in their day, eloquently advocated it, while senates mocked and jeered. They were among the "visionaries." But their vision extended beyond the horizon and the mists which limited the intellectual forecast of the men who laughed at them.

These illustrious men, like the Mohammedans who erected the incomparable Mosque of Cordova and the scarcely less magnificent one of Seville, "builded better than they knew." The Spanish Mussulman little fancied that he was constructing the most glorious of shrines for Christian worship when he reared these most beautiful edifices. And little dreamed Cobden or Sumner or so many others, in bringing each his stone and fashion-

ing it and fitting it into that scheme of International Arbitration, that they were building up for the Papacy a sanctuary of international justice destined to last for all time, and to confer on the human race blessings untold and un hoped for.

God works slowly through the ages, while elaborating anything which is to last forever. He is eternal and can bide His time. We Catholics know that His Church is also fated never to die. She can allow the wave of the present anti-Christian persecution to sweep by the rock on which she is seated, and the fierce tide of blasphemy and hate to cover her feet with its froth. Did not timid and short-sighted Christians in the days of Cromwell, as well as in those of Robespierre, believe that the Rock of Peter was shaken to its foundations, and was about to be rent and engulfed in the waves? Lo! the ocean-tides since then have encircled the earth, purifying and renovating it, destroying and overwhelming that only which was perishable or hurtful, and leaving the Rock of Peter more firm than the foundations of the earth, because reposing on the Truth of God's unfailing Promises.

The principle of an International Tribunal and of a permanent jurisdiction attached thereto is already an intellectual factor in the life of modern nations. More than one formidable obstacle will have to be overcome before the Pope can be universally accepted as the official mediator and arbitrator. But the currents of public opinion set in motion in the English speaking world alone will end in proposing or accepting the Pope in this capacity.

We may take as a sample of the opposition to be expected the insensate clamor raised in Canada at the present moment, about the last act of arbitration performed by the Holy See, the decision just given with regard to the indemnity offered by the Provincial Government of Quebec to the Catholic Church in that province for the Jesuit Estates which escheated to the crown in the year 1800.

A letter published in the Paris edition of the New York *Herald*, in the first days of March, and written from Montreal, represents the act of Leo XIII. as another "Papal aggression." It would be impossible to condense into as many lines as this letter contains a greater number of falsehoods, reckless misrepresentations, and unblushing perversions of fact. The tone and animus of the writer are those of the lowest and worst type of Orangemen, strikingly reminding us of what was written and published by the anti-Catholic press of Montreal in 1849-50, and what was uttered by the Orange leaders in the Canadian Parliament before and after the riots which led to the assault on the Governor-General, Lord Elgin, and on his Prime-Minister, Mr. Lafontaine, as well as to the burning down of the Parliament House and the destruction of the mag-

nificent library, with its manuscript treasures, an irreparable loss to the students of colonial history.

Then the cause assigned for the hostility to the Queen's representative, and the apology offered for the vandalism which spared not the Government buildings and attempted to set fire to Catholic churches and convents, was that Lord Elgin had given his signature to a bill indemnifying the French Canadians for losses endured during the short-lived flare-up called the Papineau rebellion. Some villages were ruthlessly and wantonly burned down, and the churches pillaged and destroyed by the British troops under General Gore. He, as the writer of this article can testify, was in sympathy with the rioters and incendiaries of 1849. It was his custom, in his drinking-bouts with his intimates, to use the consecrated chalice taken from one of the churches, that of St. Denis, if we mistake not.

Such was the *anti-Papist* spirit which resisted the very moderate indemnity granted to the injured Catholic Canadians in 1849 by a majority of the Provincial Parliament. And such is the same unhallowed and un-Christian spirit which still survives among the Orangemen all along the St. Lawrence, and which, after vainly protesting against the very moderate indemnity offered to the Canadian Church for the former Jesuit Estates, now resent and misrepresent as an act of Papal aggression or religious persecution the sentence pronounced by the Pope, in his quality of arbitrator chosen by the Government itself.

It was simply an act which concerned Catholics, the dispute being between the Jesuits on the one hand, who claimed the entire indemnity offered by the Government, and the Canadian Archbishops and Bishops on the other.

But the unjust and uncharitable spirit personified by Orangeism at home and abroad, will always end in discrediting the cause these fanatics advocate and which they still more disgrace by their acts of violence, outrage and bloodshed.

The excitement created in Lower and Upper Canada by the furious outcries of these Orangemen and the shameful countenance given to their unpatriotic and un-Christian conduct by some members, at least, of the Protestant Episcopal body, will not, we firmly believe, lead to a collision of creeds and races, to anything like the civil war now spoken of in the New York press.

Nor will the anti-Papal prejudices, still so strong, not only in Protestant lands and the Greek Empire, but in more than one nominally Catholic country, avail to block the march of ideas or to prevent the good sense of the human race from drawing logical conclusions from lofty and avowed principles, especially when the

dearest interests of humanity and the peace of the world are on the side of logic.

The prompt action of the Holy See when Germany and Spain invoked its *mediation*, and the no less prompt acceptance by both Governments of the proposed terms of agreement, made a deep impression in the diplomatic as well as in the industrial world. In a few weeks after the Pope had undertaken to examine the difficulty he had found for both nations an honorable way out of it; and the war-cloud which hung over Spain passed away like the mists of the morning.

We can take the judgment of the London *Spectator* on this speedy and uncostly issue to what threatened to be a serious international quarrel, as the judgment of sound common sense among the non-Catholic masses of Great Britain and the United States.

"Humanity is in search of an arbitrator of unquestionable impartiality;" so speaks the London journal. "Under many respects the Pope is, by his station, marked out for this office. He holds a rank which permits both monarchs and republics to have recourse to him without any sacrifice of their dignity. As a consequence of his mission, the Pope is not only impartial as between all nations, but he stands on such an elevation as to make their differences imperceptible to his eyes. There remains the question of religion; but this difficulty is growing daily less. No country could, in this respect, entertain greater prejudices than Germany. Well, Prince Bismarck consented to address himself to the head of the Roman Church. 'I shall not go to Canossa,' the Chancellor said; 'but if the Pope decides that our pretensions with regard to the Carolinas Islands are not just, I shall not contest with Spain the possession of the Carolinas.' Evidently the Carolinas are of very little importance to Prince Bismarck; but the fact that the proudest statesman on the Continent acknowledges before the world that he may, without loss of dignity, submit his conduct in an international transaction to the judgment of the Pope, is an extraordinary proof that the Pope still holds in our modern skeptical world an exceptional position. Without a territory, without soldiers, without revenues, without the right conferred by birth, without material forces, a Christian Pontiff is acknowledged by the master of armies to be his superior in one sense.

"Such a choice is not, after all, a triumph for material might and it tells us clearly that the Pope is, in certain cases, the actual arbitrator of the civilized world."

Long before 1885 and the incident of the Carolinas, as M. Lacointa remarks, Mr. David Urquhart, a Protestant like Prince Bismarck, addressed in 1869 to Pope Pius IX. a letter, "The appeal of a Protestant to the Pope for the restoration of the Public Law

of Nations." The appeal was in Latin, and was remarkable for its elevation of thought and its true eloquence.

"Might is an uncertain good," he says, "and glory is but vanity. That alone is powerful and durable which can supply a remedy for the diseases and aberrations of mankind.

"This is the power placed in your hands. Other power or hope there is none. I beseech you, most holy Father, that you call forth the lofty and all-pervading intelligence of the Roman Church for the purpose of cultivating this science (of International Law), which the ancients denominated the science concerned *about things human and divine*, and which made Pagan Rome so great, so noble and so venerable. This, also, depends on your power and good will.

"Come to the help of the wretched, who are alike unable to bear with or cure the evils they have brought on themselves. Come! I beseech you by your royal station, by your ancient title, by the memories of the past, by the Imperial City in which you dwell, by the very Latin tongue you make use of!"¹

This appeal was especially for the establishment in Rome of a great School of International Law as an auxiliary to the practice of the Roman Pontiff's mediatorial and judicial office. It was made while the Bishops of all Christendom were assembling for the Vatican Council, a spectacle which deeply impressed men of lofty intelligence and peace-loving, such as David Urquhart.

Two years before that, in 1867, Dr. Von Ketteler, Bishop of Mayence, urged and developed the necessity of such a school in Rome. After recalling the institutions of antiquity, the ancient constitutions of England and the Mussulman legislation already mentioned, he quoted the words of a petition addressed to the Pope eighteen years previously by a number of English Catholics. "We need such laws," they said, "in a society of virtuous citizens. Still, unless the Catholic Church raises her voice, these traditions will disappear in Europe, stifled by material interests, by the spirit of vain-glory, by a skepticism which keeps pace with immorality. The result would be a general confusion, followed by the chastisement of universal servitude."

The petitioners, therefore, besought the Pontiff to found in Rome,

¹ "Anceps est potentia et gloria vana; id tantum potens et durabile quod remedium ad morbos et errores hominum afferat. Potentia illa tuis in manibus sita est. Potentia alia non est, necipes. Oro te, Beatissime pater, ut intelligentiam excelsam et undique permeantem Romanæ Ecclesiæ evoces ad istam scientiam colendam, ab antiquis *de rebus humanis et divinis dictam*, perquam Roma pagana magna, nobiles, et ynexanda fuit. Hoc quoque apud potestatem et voluntatem tuam est. Miseris, qui mala se ipsis illata nec tolerare nec sanare possunt, in auxilium venias, per dignitatem regiam, per antiquam titulum tuum, per præteriti memoriam, per Urbem sedem imperii quam incolis, per linguam ipsam qua uteres, oro."

beneath the protection of the Apostolic See, a college solely destined to teach international law and the true principles of social order.

This, be it said here, is one of the objects sought by M. Lacointa in editing the classic work of Count Kamarowsky. It has already been submitted to the Holy Father.

Now let us glance at the book of the noble Professor of International Law in the University of Moscow.

II.

The title itself is a bold one: "The International Tribunal." It tells the reader that such a tribunal either actually exists or is in a forward state of preparation. It leaves no room for thinking of mere theories or utopias. It suggests at once to the mind grand practical results, such as one expects from an international institution called to deal with the mighty issues of war, with the manifold interests of peace and its industries, and with the ever-increasing relations with each other of nations and continents, and the isles of the ocean.

The work is divided into four books, of which book first treats of "the means for ending the conflicts which arise between states"; book second recounts "the origin and history of the *idea* of an International Tribunal"; book third treats of the "theoretical development of the same idea"; the fourth and last deals with the "fundamental principles on which such a tribunal reposes."

Of course from a Russian, and one professing the creed of the Orthodox Greek Church, we are not to expect perfect conformity on doctrinal points with what the Catholic Church teaches. Still, one is pleased to find Count Kamarowsky give such definitions of international law and such statements of the great principles which underlie it as our best theologians and jurists would be disposed to quarrel with.

"International union," he says (that is, the union of nations between themselves), "although only dating from the beginning of modern history, continues to strike deeper and deeper roots into the relations of peoples and into science. The origin, the development, and the final aim of this union may be better understood by following the path of history. It has its essential foundation in the unity of the human race and is destined to bind together by juridical principles, into one superior whole, all states, the living members of humanity. The jurisprudence which springs from this union, and which has for its purpose this objective aim, is international jurisprudence. In itself the result of the historic life of humanity, this jurisprudence can only be understood by those who see in law not barren varieties and modifications of rules, of sta-

tutes or theoretical conceptions, but ever-living revelations of the sentiment of the race."

States, like private individuals, are moved by intellectual aberrations, by passions, by interest. The shock of these motive forces provokes armed conflicts. "To resist war and to restrain it by every possible means is the lofty mission of international law. Without law the peaceful and progressive development of humanity is impossible.

The author enumerates the general character of the trespasses committed against the law of nations by the nations themselves or by individuals for whom their respective governments are held responsible, as well as the methods of repairing the wrong thus done and of ending the difficulties and conflicts thence arising. Jurists differ in their classification of the means of solving such difficulties. This involves a brief survey of international procedure, and with this the author concludes his introduction to his work.

"A definite principle on which to base all such classifications," Count Kamarowsky says, "is found in the factors which determine and direct the life of nations. There are three of them: force, interests, and law or right. Each of these factors is related to a special category of the means of defence. On force repose coercive measures. Political and economical interests, being the principal objects of political action, lead men to the use of diplomatic means.

"These two means of redress were long the only ones thought of by peoples in defending themselves. Little by little law looms up as destined to replace both coercion and diplomacy in the future. It is growing up by their side and is elaborating purely juridical means of defence. To this tendency, we allow ourselves to hope, belongs the future. . . .

"*Force*, in a civilized society, is only called on to support law; from law alone it derives its efficiency, but its application should be confined within the limits marked by a wise policy. *Interests* form, in general, one of the principal elements in the formation and development of law. This, however, is not the only element. Another and a more important one is the moral element, emanating from the principle of justice, which is formed in the conscience of nations, under the influence of the moral and religious principles inherent in them."

These extracts prepare the reader for the course which the author intends to pursue, and gives a foretaste of the spirit which animates him in the discussion of the great theme he has undertaken.

We pass over the chapter which treats of the coercive measures resorted to for terminating international conflicts, to come to the

close of the next chapter, which deals at length with diplomatic measures. The author thus sums up what relates to these and to their efficacy in preventing wars, or in doing justice to aggrieved or wronged parties.

"We draw the following deductions: 1st. Mediation, as a political form of negotiating, is applicable to every kind of relations between states. It prepares the ground for a settlement, . . . but it presents no ready means of solution. Nor is any one of the states, partaking in such proceedings, held by any strict obligations. 2d. In our age . . . congresses appear as the organs of a collective mediation. . . . Publicists differ in their estimates of the value of congresses; some . . . look upon them as superfluous, or even mischievous; others . . . see in them the organs which give a voice to the general interests, and to the judicial convictions of the civilized world. 3d. Nevertheless, experience shows that congresses contribute very little toward the pacification of peoples, and the establishment of a common jurisprudence. . . . Then the great powers alone take part in them. Nor is it in the name of the general principles of law and justice, so dear to all, that these powers attempt to mediate, but to forward each its own narrow and selfish political interests. 4th. The strife thus essentially existing between these self-constituted mediators paralyzes all attempts at mediation, and prevents them from seeking the triumph of law. 5th. Conferences called for the purpose of mediating are devoid of the very first quality requisite toward that—impartiality."

So does the thesis developed by the author, step by step, tend to demonstrate the necessity of the mediator we know of.

The third chapter of this first book, which treats of the juridical means of pacification, is full of deep instruction for both statesman and student.

"RIGHT," he says, "*le droit*, is the law of coexistence of men in society. Its roots as well as its final purpose are found in the moral order which God has established. Contemporary jurisprudence places in the foreground the system of man's wants, and thereby explains the birth and development of right.

"But this manner of conceiving things is inadequate, for the sole reason that, in studying the juridical order, it contents itself with looking only at the outside.

"Right springs from two things particular to human nature; first, from the fact of man's being a *person*, . . . stamping with the seal of his *personality* all his relations toward others. Right springs from the peculiarities, bad and good alike, of human nature. Right, in the second place, springs from the *social nature* of man. For inasmuch as man is a *person*, he cannot live in isolation either physical

or spiritual. The ideas of personality and sociability derive reciprocally from each other, and support each other mutually. Therefore it is that the whole life of man is spent in *unions*.

"A special right (or jurisprudence), resulting from the life of such union, properly belongs to every kind of union or to every form of community.

"Thus has sprung up, not by the force of theoretical speculations, but by the very force of the needs of human life, and waxes still more vigorous, *the great community of states, or the International Union*. This Union has its own peculiar right or body of laws,—international right or law, which is that of humanity; and this law, although expressed only by some isolated members of the union, is created by the common life of the civilized world, until such time as it becomes the creation of the entire human race."¹

To jurists these extracts will convey some notion of the scientific precision with which Count Kamarowsky states his principles. To theologians and philosophers they indicate the solidity and elevation of his doctrine.

The second book traces the progress in history of this idea of an international tribunal. Even arbitration, the most perfect form of solving difficulties within states themselves or from one state to another, was not unknown in remote antiquity. After the death of Darius (486 B.C.), son of Hystaspes, a dispute arose between his sons, Xerxes and Ariamenes, which was ended by the sentence of their uncle, Artaphernes, as family judge or arbitrator. Xenophon also mentions that a dispute between Cyrus and the king of Assyria was submitted to the arbitration of one of the princes of India.

In the remotest ages religious authorities were mostly chosen as arbitrators. The Amphictyonic Councils in Greece, that of Delphi, and Pylos especially, judged all differences arising between the Grecian states. There the deputies of these states met twice annually. But the reverence with which the decisions of the Amphictyons were received in the best ages of Grecian liberty declined with that liberty itself, till, at length, the councils became a servile tool in the hands of Philip of Macedon.

Among the Romans, who aspired to universal domination, the only institution which had anything like the character of an international tribunal, was the *Recuperators*, courts organized occasionally in Rome to examine the claims of the subjects of foreign states, either against the Roman authorities or the citizens. Under the Republic, conventions were agreed upon between Rome and

¹ *Le Tribunal International*, pp. 103-105.

the provinces of Italy for the examining of such claims and granting redress. Later, like conventions were made with distant states or sovereigns, such as Carthage, Philip of Macedon, and King Antiochus.

The rules which guided these courts were a mixed code, made up of the Roman law and the laws of the foreign states concerned. They thus contained germs of international jurisprudence.

Coming to the Christian era and the Middle Ages, Count Kamrowsky finds himself face to face with the Church and the salutary action of the Roman Pontiff. Here he is entirely misled by the prejudices of birth, education and creed, which so unhappily warp the intelligence of so many fair-minded Protestants among ourselves.

"The idea of an International Tribunal," he says, "manifests itself more distinctly, albeit in an original form, during the Middle Ages than in antiquity. It showed itself in that sphere where first sprang up in Europe a community between the nations, namely, in the sphere of religion. United by a common origin, the European peoples adopted almost simultaneously the Christian faith, and thereby acquired the resources of a new life, of a life superior both in its moral and social aspects.

"Personal arbitrary power, amid the rude manners of the epoch of the transmigration of the barbarian peoples, knew no limits; and there was hardly anything that could be called a central power. When, later, the Feudal order became established, the state had the character of a civil society, not of a political union. It was based upon private right, on the right of property and contract, and did not express the union of the people; because, instead of a people forming a whole, we meet anywhere with classes pursuing their own interests and enjoying independent rights.

"It is not to be wondered at, considering these conditions, that the Church took on herself, or received, outside of and beyond her direct and spiritual mission, the importance of a predominant social power. Many rights, belonging at bottom to the state, were placed in her hands, a condition of things useful in that epoch of anarchy. Thus it was that the Papacy, under the influence of circumstances, and thanks to the rare genius and energy of the Roman Pontiffs, arose and gained strength in western Europe. The Popes, during their period of power, from Gregory VII. to Boniface VIII., after an obstinate struggle of several centuries, looked upon themselves as the sovereigns of Europe.

"For a time the belief might have obtained that Theocracy had gained a final victory.

"The Popes claimed unlimited power, not only over men's bodies, but over their souls."¹

Of course no Catholic need be told that the Popes never put forth any such claim. The Church was, under God, the creator of the Christendom which arose on the ruins of the old Pagan world, and the veneration and gratitude of the peoples she had regenerated and moulded to civilization and Christian life attributed to their Mother all the authority and liberty which their filial love could bestow.

The Pope, the Vicar of Christ on earth, was the directing mind, the governing hand in the Church; who could claim over the nations the moral power which naturally, spontaneously, flowed from his divinely-appointed office? Peoples and kings gave to him willingly, lovingly, much more than he ever claimed. Read the life and writings of Pope St. Gregory the Great, and you will find in them the whole secret of the marvellous and salutary influence of the Papacy in the Middle Ages. It was that of Moses and Aaron leading the Twelve Tribes from degradation and bondage to freedom and nationality. It was that of Samuel ruling that nation within its own territory, standing between God and the people, and securing them against all temporal disasters so long as they listened to his voice and followed his guidance.

Well, Photius separated the East from the Holy See, broke up the unity of Christendom, subjected the Greek Church to the despotic yoke of the Byzantine emperors, and invited by the division and degeneracy thus created the Turks to destroy both Church and Empire. Has the Russian Church or the Russian people gained by setting aside, even in the social and international orders, the mediatorial offices and moral influence of Christ's Vicar?

Has Luther, by breaking up the unity of Western Christendom and substituting Henry VIII., Prince Bismarck or the Marquis of Salisbury for the Pope and his Legates in the Government of the Church, or the settling of domestic difficulties within states themselves, been less of a curse to humanity than his prototype, Photius?

Count Kamarowsky quotes, in support of his prejudiced assertions, the authority of the Protestant, Ward, who in 1795 published "*An Inquiry into the Foundation and History of the Law of Nations in Europe.*" Not having the original English text, we translate from the French before us: "He who filled the Chair of Peter was to a certain point the master of Europe. In his quality of presumed mediator between heaven and earth, he decided who

¹ *Ibidem.*

was right and who was wrong; a great casuist when conflicts arose, he played toward kings, who recognized no tribunal above themselves, the rôle of censor and guardian of morals (*custos morum*).

"Thus was established a common tribunal for Europe in the circumstances in which it was most needed. The weak found a support in it; the powerful a restraint; the divinest of ideas, that of justice, could manifest itself freely, and the head of Christendom could, in very deed, be a personage worthy of his rank. This institution would have been excellent if the Popes had not made an ill use of their position, and if the imperfection of our nature had allowed the union, in the hands of one man, of wisdom and virtue in the necessary measure."

The translator of Count Kamarowsky's book, Mr. Sergius de Westman, a Russian himself and a distinguished diplomat, quotes in a foot-note a passage from Châteaubriand which not only refutes what is erroneous in the above passages, but completes the truth of the precious admissions of both the Russian professor and the English publicist.

"If one only takes a wider survey of the influence of Christianity on the political existence of the peoples of Europe, one cannot help seeing," says the illustrious Frenchman, "that religion saved them from famine, and saved our forefathers from their own mad passions, by proclaiming these truces called *the peace of God*, during which people gathered in their harvests and made their vintage. In the public troubles the Popes often showed themselves to be very great princes. They it was who, sounding the alarm, and organizing leagues, prevented Western Europe from becoming the prey of the Turks. This single service rendered by the Church to the world would deserve the raising of altars in her honor.

"Men undeserving of the name of Christians exterminated the native tribes of the New World, and the Court of Rome fulminated bulls to prevent such atrocities. Slavery was looked upon as legitimate; but the Church would acknowledge no slaves among her children. . . . Kings became more circumspect; they felt that there was a power able to control them, and that the people had in that power a protecting ægis. The Rescripts of the Pontiffs never failed to mingle the voice of nations and the general interests of mankind with the complaints addressed to individuals. '*We have heard that Philip, that Ferdinand, that Henry is oppressing his people*,' etc. . . . Such was the beginning of nearly all similar decrees of the Court of Rome."

But Châteaubriand has one paragraph which directly touches

on the central idea of Count Kamarowsky's work: "If there existed," he says, "in the midst of Europe a tribunal that could judge, in the name of God, nations and sovereigns, and which could prevent wars and revolutions,—this tribunal would be the masterpiece of political wisdom, and the last degree of social perfection. The Popes, by the influence which they exercised in the Christian world, were, for a moment, near realizing this beautiful dream."¹

Compare what Mr. Ward says above, in the passage we have underlined, of this Central Court or International Tribunal, and you will see how paltry are the objections raised by national or sectarian prejudice.

We must here take leave of Count Kamarowsky and his book. We believe that the idea which he has developed with such scientific skill and such deep conviction of the truth, the necessity, and the practicability of the institution he advocates, will bear its fruit in the not distant future.

We believe that the coming twentieth century will see in Rome, as a thing permanent and acknowledged by all nations, that International Tribunal, with the Papal authority as its central light, and side by side with the Pope, sovereign once more in his own city, will arise that College or School of International Jurisprudence which will furnish to the Pope, in the exercise of his mediatorial functions or of his office as supreme arbitrator, the counsellors and assessors who will help him to secure the peace of the world, and thereby to forward all the glorious interests of human industry and Christian civilization.

¹ Châteaubriand, *Génie du Christianisme*. See the chapter in vol. ii., entitled *Politique et Gouvernement*.

O'CONNELL'S CORRESPONDENCE.

Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, the Liberator. Edited, with Notices of His Life and Times, by W. J. Fitzpatrick, F.S.A., author of the "Life, Times, and Correspondence of Bishop Doyle;" "Life and Times of Lord Cloncurry," etc. Two volumes. New York: Longmans, Green & Co. 1888. For sale by the Catholic Publication Society, New York.

THAT "history repeats itself" is one of the tritest of sayings. Never, perhaps, has the truth of the saying been more strongly exemplified than by the recent publication of the correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, a correspondence that throws a flood of light on the times in which that great man lived, of which he formed so great a part, of the long and uphill fight he fought, of the forces and agencies against which he had to contend, and of the whole story of the Irish struggle from the day he took it in hand until the day he laid it down only at death's door.

To read the book, which has been edited by a master-hand, is, in its way, singularly like reading Ireland's story of to-day under her present political leader. Though the contrast between the genius and the characteristics of the two leaders, O'Connell and Parnell, is most marked, yet, in the main, we find Parnell following, whether consciously or not, very closely in the lines marked out and invented by O'Connell. The difference between the two is rather one of position and of time than of method. O'Connell was compelled to take up single-handed what seemed a hopeless fight against all the prejudices and traditions, the order and regulations, of the most powerful empire of his time. At the beginning of the battle—of the war, rather—he had no following at his back save the heart of the Irish people, and that heart never failed him. A giant in intellect as in physique, a man on whom the Almighty had bestowed every quality and qualification needed to sustain him in his gigantic struggle, he succeeded in breaking down, not by a rush or lucky assault, but by the most skilful and calculated generalship, the barriers of centuries, the rooted bulwarks of systematized tyranny, oppression, resistance to the will of the people, and denial of civil and religious liberty to the Irish people in fact, but to all peoples in principle. It was he who opened the breach through which Parnell and his followers are marching to victory to-day. It was he who laid the true plan of campaign that is winning over

England to-day to the Irish cause. It was he who, to adapt a phrase of the great Napoleon, found the crown of Ireland in the mire, and, picking it up, placed it, not on his own head, but on the head to which it belonged—the nation's. For it is plain from this correspondence that O'Connell was a republican by conviction, and regarded the government of the United States as the best of human governments. "You ask me," he writes to Sir Henry Jervis, of Wexford, an officer in the Royal Navy, who had addressed O'Connell in the bluff style of an old sailor, "who are to be understood as THE PEOPLE, the source of legitimate power." And here is his answer :

"I reply. All those not possessed of prerogative or privileged capacities. *Not* the king in his corporate capacity,—*not* the peers in their privileged state,—but all those who are neither king nor peers. In short, the Commons, for whose benefit the king *ought* to reign, and for whose benefit alone the privileges of the peers *ought* to exist. . . .

"You presume to talk to me of the 'dregs' of the people. Whom do you dare to call amongst the people by the abusive epithet of 'dregs?' Not the rich and the titled, I warrant, but the laborious and the poor. Now, as to the poor and laboring classes, I will not allow you to claim any superiority over them. You thought fit to bestow your tediousness on me for a long half-hour, during which you condescended to exhibit to me your views on various local and general topics, and I can confidently assert that I have frequently received in five minutes, from one of the poor and laboring classes, more information and more sound views of public policy than I did from you in your entire half-hour.

"Again, sir, you presume to assail the spirit of democratic liberty—the only rational spirit of freedom—by calling a democracy 'the worst, the most brutal, and senseless of tyrannies.' How ignorant you must be of the first elements of political history, and how utterly blind to the scenes that are passing before your eyes.

"What country in the world is it in which the national debt is on the verge of inevitable extinction; in which taxation is on the point of being reduced to the lowest possible quantity; in which peace reigns within its borders; in which abundance crowns the labors of the fields; in which commerce and domestic industry flourish and increase; in which individual happiness rewards the private virtue and enterprise of the citizens; and which, in fine, is as honored abroad as it is prosperous at home?

"What state is thus respected by foreign powers, and thus happy in its internal relations? It is a democracy—a democracy without one single admixture of monarchical or aristocratical principle—America."

Here, indeed, spoke a true tribune of the people. How far O'Connell's estimate, how far his prescience fell above or below the reality and the innate strength of this democratic power and people, may be left to the judgment of the reader. It should be remembered that he wrote that letter in 1834, when as yet the Republic of the United States was an infant, though a giant infant, among the nations and the powers of the world. At that time the gold-fields of California were not dreamed of, nor the cruel famine that created the Irish exodus to this country and broke the heart of O'Connell. Little did even he dream of the mighty growth that would spring from that famine. If ever there was need of conversion, the result of the Irish exodus was most surely to convert the Republic of the United States to the Irish cause; at a time, too, when the Republic ranks foremost among the foremost powers of the world.

It will be seen, from the letter quoted, that O'Connell, when dealing with an adversary, did not mince his words. He never minced them nor his meaning. It is said of him, even by admirers, that at times he was coarse in his language. Very possibly he was; but he had constantly to deal with base assailants on whom the refined amenities of attack and retort would have been wasted. His heart was warm in the fullest sense; and his mind followed rather than guided, the impulse of his heart. For personal enemies he cared nothing and had no enmity against them; but against enemies of "the cause, the cause, the sacred cause," as he was constantly exclaiming of Ireland, he was a lion, who sprang with a lion's spring, roared with a lion's roar, and struck with a lion's paw. Between the ebullient passion of O'Connell and the frozen passion of Parnell there is a world of contrast; yet underneath the surface the same fire burned.

Yes, and both had the same forces to contend against; enemies from within—spies, traitors, fanatics in the camp—as well as the host of enemies from without. Precisely the same forces, precisely the same agencies, were set at work and utilized by the English Government against O'Connell as against Parnell and his party to-day. There was coercion; there was bribery and corruption; there was abuse of the judicial power and packing of the juries; there was incitement to the people to revolt in order to justify the tyranny of the government; there was subornation of the press—the London *Times* appears frequently in O'Connell's correspondence in exactly the same sense as it has recently figured against Parnell; there were appeals to strong fanaticism; there were secret appeals to Rome to smite the arm of the Liberator; there were in England men whom O'Connell characteristically describes as "crawling Cawtholics"; there were in

Ireland some, though not many, "Crown priests," and a few ultra-cautious prelates; and there were the various secret societies which O'Connell dreaded most of all and which he regarded from first to last as the most dangerous enemies of Ireland and the greatest obstacles to the restoration of her liberties. How wise he was in this is sufficiently illustrated by the disclosures made by spies and informers before the Commission appointed to adjudicate on the "Parnellism and Crime" charges of the *London Times*. Add to this a series of inefficient Irish Viceroy's and brutal Irish Secretaries, an army of military and police to suppress Irish patriotism, courts constituted to convict Irish patriots; and some faint conception may be formed of what this one man accomplished in the way of Irish independence. Truly may it be said of him that he not only created a policy and a party, but he resurrected a nation. He was the Moses of his people. He was their law-giver. He it was who broke the bondage under which they had so long suffered; who led them and upheld them in the weary and disheartening journey through the desert of despondency and despair; and who died at last without even a glimpse of the promised land.

"Whoever," says Lecky, the historian, "turns over the magazines or newspapers of the period, must at once perceive how grandly O'Connell's figure dominated in politics—how completely he had dispelled the indifference that had so long prevailed on Irish questions—how clearly his agitation stands forth as the great event of the time." Greville, who was certainly English enough, and who knew courts and cabinets to the core, says in his "Memoirs": "History will speak of him as one of the most remarkable men who ever existed; he will fill a great space in its pages; his position was unique: there never was before, and there never will be again, anything at all resembling it." He attained to such a power that he made and unmade cabinets and ministries in England. He was more dreaded than a hostile army. His name and the principles which he advocated spread throughout Europe, throughout the civilized world, and lit the flame of freedom in every oppressed land. The crushed Catholics of France took fire from his teaching, and the founders of the *Avenir*, De Lammenais, Montalembert, Lacordaire, Ozanam, fairly worshipped him, and taking heart from his example, forced liberty of speech, freedom of worship, freedom of the press, freedom of Christian education, from a reluctant atheistical government. Pope Pius IX. paid one of the highest tributes to his character and genius as a statesman. The celebrated Father Ventura delivered one of the most eloquent panegyrics on him. The range of his power and influence was not confined to the British Empire, but extended far beyond. Though his heart throbbed first and always for the restoration of

the liberties and self-government of Ireland, that heart embraced in its scope all oppressed peoples and turned against all tyrannical governments. His was a colossal vigor, and all who suffered under injustice looked to him for inspiration and guidance. His force as a statesman was not national alone; it was international; and his name is deservedly a word to conjure with in Ireland to this day, as it will be to all future time; so long, at least, as Ireland is peopled by the Irish. In Ireland's history thus far, two great figures stand forth pre-eminently: the one, the Apostle; the other, the Liberator of Ireland. St. Patrick drew the people out of the darkness of Paganism; O'Connell drew them out of the darkness of despotism.

The life of O'Connell is sufficiently known to all students of English and Irish history. Many biographies of him have appeared and many works by various authors in which he was made the central figure. Indeed, it is impossible to read the history, more especially the political history, of his time without finding the name and the presence of O'Connell on almost every page. In English politics he was the Warwick of his day: the king-maker, so far as the king's cabinet went. In Irish politics he was the Alpha and Omega; so history must deal with him. But here for the first time we have his own story as told by himself in his letters to his family, his friends, his foes, his acquaintances; literally the story of his life from day to day, dashed off in the hurry of the few moments he could snatch from a multitude and tangle of cares and occupations that would be overwhelming to most men even of extraordinary capacity and business ability. On they pour: a constant torrent leaping from the great heart and mind and illustrating every phase of the simple yet many-sided character of the man, illustrating also the history of the times. But through all, whether it be a loving message to his wife, to his children, a joyous or despondent letter to a friend, an appeal or rebuke to a political opponent, a communication to the press, a rollicking snack of the gossip of the hour, an exposition of a plan of action, a warning here, an exhortation there, a jubilant note or a wail of woe, there runs the same tone of a man with a fixed and great purpose, of a great heart, and none can read these letters, the outpourings of his inner soul, without feeling the beatings and the throbings of that heart which was invincible until it broke on what he thought to be the grave of his country.

Nowhere does a man reveal himself so thoroughly as in the letters which, admirably collated and annotated, form the bulk of these volumes. Most of the letters were not intended for publication; and those which were intended for publication were written for the press of the day. Those, however, who would study

O'Connell will study him at his best here. He was born in August, 1775, at Carhen, near Cahirciveen, County Kerry. He died in Genoa on his way to Rome in May, 1847. His life embraces a period of seventy-two years. His education began at Cove, near Cork. Thence, owing to the restriction placed on Catholic education by the English government, he was sent to St. Omer and afterwards to Douay. While in France he witnessed the outbreak of the first French revolution, and the horrors attending it left an indelible impression on his mind. The correspondence begins with letters from St. Omer "written in the large hand of a child." The child's letters are those of any college boy, but display a dutiful spirit and affectionate heart. The correspondence ends with O'Connell's departure for the Rome he never lived to reach.

In January, 1793, the boy, who was then eighteen years of age, wrote to his uncle Maurice from Douay, that "the present state of affairs in this country is truly alarming; the conduct the English have pursued with regard to the French in England makes us dread to be turned off every day. In case of a war with England this is almost inevitable." Uncle Maurice, who paid for the education of his nephews, immediately ordered them home on the receipt of this news. A John Sheares, who was afterwards hanged in the Irish rebellion of 1798, accompanied the boys from Calais to Dover. Sheares shocked O'Connell by exultingly exhibiting a handkerchief which he had soaked in the blood of Louis XVI. as it flowed from the scaffold. O'Connell was horrified at the acts of the Revolutionists and left France almost a Tory at heart, as he often said. When the English packet boat on which he sailed had got under way he tore the tricolor cockade, worn for safety at the time in France, into the sea. "Some French fishermen, rowing past, cursed him," says Mr. Fitzpatrick, "as they reverently rescued the cockade." Such was one of the opening incidents in the dawning manhood of the author of the "bloodless revolution" which to the last he advocated, and which has been so wisely and effectively taken up by his successor to-day.

The story of the struggle for Catholic emancipation needs no re-telling here. It has long since gone into history as one of the greatest of political achievements in the face of what at the time were considered insurmountable obstacles. In order to emancipate a nation in the sense of recovering for it what, after all, was at the time but partial religious freedom, O'Connell had to conquer a nation more powerful than imperial Rome in her palmyest days. He had to educate, not the English mind alone, but the Irish mind also. For Ireland had been so long under the ban and walking in the valley of the shadow of death, that the people had lost heart, or whatever heart was left to them found expression in

the abortive attempts of casual secret societies, which accomplished nothing, save to give excuse for the hand of the enemy pressing heavier on the unhappy land. It was his great ambition and achievement to organize the people and infuse his own heart, soul and intelligence into them. Nor in his purpose, terrible as he was in battle and volcanic in his wrath when thoroughly aroused, did he discriminate between the orange and the green. It was his wish from first to last to blend the colors into a national wreath to set upon the brow of Erin. If he failed in this magnanimous and patriotic desire, the fault of the failure lay neither with him nor with those, both Catholic and Protestant, who followed his lead and inspiration.

"In 1800," says the editor, "O'Connell opposed the Union, and the day-dream of his life was its repeal. This was sternly demanded in 1810 by the Dublin Corporation, then held by ultra-Tories; and O'Connell hailed with joy the probable junction of orange and green." In the January of that year, O'Connell writes to Sir James Riddall, the High Sheriff of Dublin: "I entertain a very strong and, I will add, a very grateful sense of that patriotic zeal which instigates you to bring together your countrymen of every persuasion upon every occasion in your power. Believe me, I should feel sincere pleasure in any efforts of mine, however humble, to co-operate in the desirable result of combining all classes in mutual affection and in the common defence of our common country."

Here is struck the key-note of O'Connell's entire political career; reconciliation, friendship, unity among all classes, castes and persuasions; equal civil and religious liberty for all; the two nations enjoying equal rights and privileges under the one crown. O'Connell constantly repudiated the idea of separation or dismemberment of the British Empire, which, then, as now, was raised up, and with a like success, for the purpose of disorganizing the Liberal forces in England whom O'Connell had won over to the Irish cause, and of inflaming the passions of the Orangemen in Ireland.

It was in 1805 that O'Connell took a lead in the Roman Catholic party of action, which was formed to force the Catholic claims on the English Parliament. Pitt, Fox, Grattan, and the old Catholic leader, Keogh, desired that the question be held in abeyance. The action at this stage of proceedings only amounted to a petition to Parliament, presenting the claims. The old-school Catholics, under the advice of their few Liberal, or Whig, as the term then was, friends in Parliament were fearful of taking even that mild step. Not so O'Connell. His mind, even thus early, was doubtless wholly clear and fully made up as to the line of action to be pursued in order to fight the English government, though

probably even he had not yet dreamed of hewing his way into the English Parliament. The attempt was at once made on the part of the government to attach an air of treason to the proceedings of the Catholic body and its committee. Mr. Pole stated in Parliament that "if gentlemen would read the debates of the Catholic Committee, they would find separation openly and distinctly recommended." O'Connell, at a meeting held in Dublin, in February, 1812, replied: "Why, this is a direct accusation of high treason, and he who would assert it of me I would brand with the foulest epithets. I defy the slightest proofs to be given of its veracity."

O'Connell was already making himself felt in England as well as in Ireland. In Ireland he was the advocate of advocates, and could win over even a hostile jury in spite of itself and of all the ill-used power of the authorities. He came to be known as "*the Counsellor*," there only being one such in all Ireland. While pursuing his professional duties with extraordinary ardor and success, pecuniarily and professionally, he was organizing the Catholic agitation throughout the country with such effect that the government began to take alarm and set its engines and agents at work to break or mar the agitation. Sir Arthur Wellesley writes (Nov. 17th, 1808) from London to Dublin Castle: "I think that as there are some interesting Catholic questions afloat just now, you might feed — with another £100." So much for him who was afterwards known as "the Great Duke," and whom O'Connell detested for his persistent hostility to Irish claims. Corruption was abroad. Resort was had to the revival of penal measures which it was thought had become dead letters. Anything to break up the Catholic agitation, as though it were a crime and a treason for a Catholic to claim his civil and religious rights, to avow and practise his religion, and to claim his place in and under a government professing to be the freest under the sun.

A proclamation was issued from Dublin Castle, in Feb., 1811, requiring every sheriff and magistrate throughout Ireland to arrest all persons connected either actively or passively "in the late elections for members or delegates to the General Committee of the Catholics of Ireland." As a consequence, Lord Fingall, the ostensible head of the movement, was arrested, together with several of his colleagues, and the movement was for the time being arrested with them, the year 1814 closing in gloom "as regards the political prospects of the Catholics," writes O'Connell's son, John. Delegation was destroyed; but O'Connell, who justly boasted that he could drive a coach and six through any act of Parliament, kept the agitation alive by holding meetings for the purpose of preparing petitions to Parliament.

O'Connell had now become such a force in political life that it was determined to destroy him at any cost. The government rightly recognized in him a born and trained leader of the people, in their eyes a most skilful and dangerous revolutionist. Nothing could terrify him, and he was so thorough a lawyer that he could not be entrapped. Those were dueling days, and challenges he received in abundance, for, as said already, he never minced his words, and his words struck home. In 1815 occurred the famous duel with D'Esterre, a member of the Dublin Corporation, and noted for his nerve and knowledge of the use of arms. He actually forced the duel on O'Connell and was killed for his pains. All the details of the duel tend to show that the authorities took more than a friendly interest in D'Esterre's action, the fatal result of which was a life-long sorrow to O'Connell, who atoned as best he could by greatly befriending D'Esterre's family afterwards.

D'Esterre was by no means the only man who called O'Connell out, nor was he the only man whom O'Connell offered to meet. Between O'Connell, Peel and Stanley, who were in turn chief secretaries for Ireland and who exercised that office in much the same spirit that Mr. Balfour exercises it to-day, there was a settled hostility. Both of those statesmen scored against O'Connell heavily at times, but on the whole he was more than a match for both, and on one occasion he so stung Peel, who was at the time chief secretary, that the latter sent him a challenge, and a meeting was arranged for on the Continent. Rumors of the affair got abroad. Both men were ready for the fray. O'Connell reached London in safety; but the authorities being on the watch he was arrested when stepping into a chaise for Dover, and there was the end of the affair, the collisions of the two statesmen being afterwards confined to parliamentary warfare in the clash of debate. His affair with Disraeli, whom he had so strongly befriended when the future Tory premier of England was entering on his political career as a Radical, is notorious. But by that time O'Connell had very wisely and properly got over his duelling propensities. He could afford to disregard such challenges, and he did so on the highest ground, that duelling was an offense not only against the law of the land, but against the divine law. Later on Disraeli, who turned on Peel just as he had turned on O'Connell, found cause bitterly to rue his treacherous attacks on the Irish chief. In an election in 1835, on the result of which the safety of the Tory administration largely depended, the Tories were badly beaten, mainly through O'Connell's influence. "Henry Stanley," wrote Disraeli, "who had promised me to vote for Sutton, voted for Abercromby. O'Connell is so powerful that he says he will be in the cabinet. It is the Irish Catholic party that has

done all the mischief." And to drop the duelling episodes, here is a characteristic description by O'Connell himself of a duel in which a relative of his was one of the principals: Writing to his son, Morgan, he asks: "Did you hear of the great duel in Ennis between Charles O'Connell and Mr. Wall? The latter abused a relation of Charley's, a Mr. Blood, and Charley knocked Wall down. They then fought, fired a shot each, came home safe and arm-in-arm together, got tipsy in company with each other, went together to the ball and danced till morning."

Strange, indeed, it seems, now that the victory has been long since won, to reflect on the blind obstinacy and malignant stupidity with which the English government and crown fought the granting of the natural and divine right of religious freedom to the Catholics. The opposing governments were, in the main, Tory, for the Whigs, whether from motives of policy or conscience, once the cry and agitation for Catholic emancipation were systematically raised, took up the cry and soon allied themselves with O'Connell, timid as they were at the beginning of the struggle. Stanley, afterwards Lord Derby, and who succeeded Peel in the leadership of the Tories, with the ex-Radical Disraeli as his crafty lieutenant, on being charged later on with deserting his Tory colors, made the flippant answer: "Anything to dish the Whigs." Possibly at the time when O'Connell had aroused his countrymen to the sense of no longer waiting, but creating and shaping, circumstances to their own favor and necessities, the thought of the Whigs in joining him was anything to beat the Tories, who were then all-powerful, and who resisted as strenuously electoral reform in England as reform of any kind in Ireland. It has been said of the Bourbons that "they never learn, and never forget." That saying precisely characterizes the Tories of the present as of the past. The Wellingtons, the Peels, the Stanleys, and their followers of the earlier part of the century, are but earlier editions of the Salisburys and Balfours of to-day, at all events in their policy towards Ireland. Disraeli was the only Tory leader who could boast with justice that he had "educated up" his party to some measure of liberal ideas. Salisbury has fallen back on the old Tory tracks, the old Tory methods, the old Tory deceits, and the old Tory contempt for public opinion, which in the end will surely overwhelm him and his party.

Some of the Crown lawyers proposed that the King should exercise a veto in the appointment of Catholic bishops, who were few enough and far enough between. To O'Connell's grief, Grattan, then in the English Parliament, and whose glory had not yet gone out, joined the vetoists, notwithstanding that, Protestant as he was, he had been one of the most eloquent advocates of Catholic

emancipation. O'Connell expressed his astonishment at this defection in a touching yet emphatic manner, which gave such offence to the then aging Grattan that in 1815 he declined to take charge of the petition for emancipation. That was bad enough in its way, but it was a still greater shock to find Dr. Murray, the future Archbishop of Dublin, two years later supporting the veto. Dr. Murray, an extremely cautious prelate, between whom and Dr. MacHale, the famous Archbishop of Tuam, occurred many a tilt later on regarding Irish national affairs, was what in these days would be described as a "Castle Bishop." Furthermore the Tories then as now had been working on Rome, such a Rome as under the sway of Bonaparte was allowed to exist, to use its influence against the Irish national movement. The Pope was a captive in the hands of Napoleon, and during his imprisonment Monsignor, afterwards Cardinal, Quarantotti acted as the Pope's vicegerent. In 1814 Mgr. Quarantotti addressed a rescript to Dr. Poynter, the bishop of the London district, conceding the veto. But then, as now, there were prelates in Ireland who, perfectly acquainted with the situation, were not afraid to speak their minds. "The result of this pernicious avowment," wrote Dr. O'Shaughnessy, Bishop of Killaloe, "if acted upon, would be fatal to the Catholic religion; therefore I hasten to protest against it, and while I have breath in my body will continue to do so." And Dr. Coppinger, Bishop of Cloyne, described the rescript as "a very dangerous document," adding: "In common with every real friend to the integrity of the Catholic religion in Ireland, I read it with feelings of disgust and indignation."

Dr. Murray, who was assistant with right of succession to Archbishop Troy, had previously compared the vetoists to Judas. "As to Dr. Troy," writes O'Connell, "better could not be expected from him. His traffic at the Castle is long notorious. . . . You cannot conceive anything more lively than the abhorrence of these vetoistical plans amongst the people at large. I really think they will go near to desert all such clergymen as do not now take an active part on the question. The Methodists were never in so fair a way of making converts." O'Connell afterwards came to esteem Archbishop Murray as a man "peculiarly formed to conquer prejudice and abash calumny." The Knight of Kerry, prominent in social and political circles at the time, took charge of the Catholic petition which Grattan had dropped, and it is interesting to note that he was ably assisted by Sir Henry Parnell.

To go into the details of the movement for Catholic emancipation, as given in this correspondence, would in itself consume an article. The letters bearing on it, however, form most instructive and interesting reading. It is enough to say that through all O'Connell was most firm and loyal to the faith. He would have

no compromise in the matter. In 1821 Mr. Plunkett, a prominent Irish member, but of course not a Catholic, for Catholics were not then eligible to a seat in Parliament, introduced an unsatisfactory Catholic Relief Bill, for the third reading of which two hundred and sixteen members voted against one hundred and ninety-seven. Lord Eldon opposed the Bill in the House of Lords "on account of the danger with which it threatened the State." Much to O'Connell's delight this "rascally Catholic bill," as he called it, was thrown out.

In 1825 a "Bill to Suppress the Catholic Association" was introduced in the House of Commons, and Shiel and O'Connell were sent as a deputation to argue the case as counsel at the bar of the House. Their arrival in England excited much curiosity, and they were received with distinction everywhere. O'Connell's letters at this time, his impressions of the House (in which he was to become so great a figure), of the English people, of the English leaders and notables, are as racy as could be. He utilized his opportunity to work upon the feelings and intelligence of the English people, much as Parnell, in one of his strong speeches, appealed from the judgment of a hostile Tory Ministry to "the great heart of England." O'Connell's gigantic figure and noble countenance and bearing attracted the attention and admiration of all. An amusing incident occurred at Wolverhampton, where they arrived with whetted appetites in early morning. It was Lent, and there was a profusion of everything but Lenten fare. Their eyes lingered longingly on what Shiel calls "an unhallowed round of beef, which seemed to have been placed on the breakfast table to lead us into temptation." But O'Connell, who, as the correspondence shows, was most observant of all his religious duties, exclaimed: "Recollect that you are in sacred precincts; the terror of the Vetoists has made Wolverhampton holy." The "terror of the Vetoists" was the venerable and illustrious Bishop Milner, who, in the face of the majority of his fellow-Catholic countrymen, and to his own great personal suffering, stood out so nobly against the Veto.

O'Connell was lionized wherever he went. Dr. Bathurst, the Protestant Bishop of Norwich, and, to his honor, an ardent advocate of Catholic emancipation, sent Sir Henry Parnell to ask O'Connell to honor him with a visit. O'Connell complied, and "a fine, lively old gentleman he is," wrote O'Connell to his "darling Heart," one of the multitude of endearing titles he has for his wife. "He is full of anxiety for Catholic emancipation, and I pray God he may live to be a Catholic himself." Singularly enough, by God's grace, the Bishop's son and daughter were converted to the Catholic faith.

O'Connell had great hopes of the success of this mission.

"Darling, darling," he writes in his customary fashion to his wife, "since I wrote the word 'free' I have been under examination (before the Committee of the House of Commons). Call my children together; tell Danny (his youngest son) to fling up his cap for old Ireland. I have now no doubt but that we shall be emancipated." How the man's heart burns within him with zeal for the cause and love for his wife and family. Such ebullitions constantly occur; and, on the other hand, his dejection when things went ill was just as mournfully expressed. At such moments his heart was an *Æolian* harp, swung by the breeze of events, and giving out its soul and its sorrow in the saddest yet most beautiful music.

O'Connell's hopes were rudely broken. The Duke of York, then heir apparent to the throne, whom O'Connell thought he had won over, rose in the House of Lords, presented petitions against Emancipation, recalled his father's "conscientious antagonism" to it, and declared that in whatever situation in life he might be placed, he would adhere to the principles thus enunciated, "so help me God!" The mission was a failure save in so far as helping to enlighten the English mind on the real and great grievances and disabilities under which the Catholic people of Ireland suffered. Ireland a little later contained a population of nine millions, the vast majority of whom were Catholics. How sadly that fine population has been depleted is known; but the depletion, sad as it is, has at least had one providential result, in spreading the Irish race and propagating it over all civilized lands, and raising up a new Ireland wherever the martyr seed fell, especially on the soil of English speaking peoples.

O'Connell went back to Ireland, empty-handed it is true, but more determined than ever to wring emancipation out of the heart of the Government. At last he made the resolve to cut the Gordian knot with the sword of Alexander. The Clare election came on, and in a stirring appeal, written off-hand, to his fellow-countrymen, he asked their votes to elect him as their representative to Parliament. Here is how he put the case as against Sir Vesey Fitzgerald, who was considered to own the county:

"You will be told I am not qualified to be elected; the assertion, my friends, is untrue. I am qualified to be elected, and to be your representative. It is true that as a Catholic I cannot, and of course never will, take the oaths at present prescribed to members of Parliament; but the authority which created these oaths—the Parliament—can abrogate them; and I entertain a confident hope that, if you elect me, the most bigoted of our enemies will see the necessity of removing from the chosen representative of the people

an obstacle which would prevent him from doing his duty to his King and to his country.

"The oath at present required by law is: 'That the sacrifice of the Mass, and the invocation of the blessed Virgin Mary and other Saints, as now practised in the Church of Rome, are impious and idolatrous.' Of course I will never stain my soul with such an oath. I leave that to my honorable opponent, Mr. Vesey Fitzgerald. He has often taken that horrible oath; he is ready to take it again, and asks your votes to enable him to swear. I would rather be torn limb from limb than take it. Electors of the county Clare, choose between me, who abominate that oath, and Mr. Vesey Fitzgerald, who has sworn it full twenty times! Return me to Parliament, and it is probable that such a blasphemous oath will be abolished forever."

Here at last was the gauntlet thrown down. Petition and appeal, which had proved profitless, yielded to an open declaration of war. The Government was astounded and amazed, as was the entire kingdom. They were challenged on the lines of the English Constitution, and they shrank from the challenge; for O'Connell in his address declared that if returned he would "vote for every measure favorable to radical reform in the representative system, so that the House of Commons may truly, as our Catholic ancestors intended it should do, represent all the people." He called for "a more equal distribution of the overgrown wealth of the Established Church in Ireland, so that the surplus may be restored to the sustentation of the poor, the aged, and the infirm." It is said of some men that they are in advance of their time. That is often true, and it was very true in O'Connell's case. But such men drop seeds which fructify in after-time, though the man who sowed them may be forgotten. Ireland had to wait for Mr. Gladstone's disestablishment of the Irish church—that "deadly upas tree," as he called it—to see O'Connell's idea carried out. In the same address he avowed his purpose to bring "the question of the repeal of the Union, at the earliest possible period, before the consideration of the legislature." Well might Lecky say that emancipation was won by "the unaided genius of a single man." Repeal of the Union was O'Connell's expression for the Home Rule demand of to-day.

His countrymen rallied to their leader. Fitzgerald, with all his local influence and all the power of the government at his back, was beaten in such a manner as to indicate to the government that a new Ireland had arisen under a new leader. "Years after," says the editor of the correspondence, "Peel admitted that he was perfectly overwhelmed" by O'Connell's victory.

And with reason was he overwhelmed. For it was not the

Premier or the Tory Government that was now on trial before the eyes of England and the world, but the English Constitution and England's pretensions to be a true representative government. The Clare election secured Catholic Emancipation, Peel being compelled to introduce the Bill, and the Act of Emancipation received a most reluctant "royal" assent on April 13th, 1829. Through what ages of untold suffering and sorrow had Ireland to wait for this act of simple justice!

O'Connell was elected in 1828, but he never occupied his seat until the passing of the Emancipation Act. Then came the memorable scene in the House of Commons. Stupid and bigoted to the last, the majority of the House decided that O'Connell could not take his seat unless he took the oath obligatory on all members at the time of his election, the oath which he had declared he would rather be torn limb from limb than take. When introduced into the House, the excitement, we are told, was intense, and expressed itself in a breathless silence among the packed assembly. The Speaker called upon him to take the oath. He asked to see it, and on its being handed to him he read it carefully, though of course he knew it by heart. Then rang out in that silent assembly of England's legislators the immortal utterance: "I see in this oath one assertion as to a matter of fact which I *know* to be false. I see in it another assertion as to a matter of opinion which I *believe* to be untrue. I therefore refuse to take that oath," and, as Mr. Richard O'Connell, B. L., an eye-witness of the scene, says, "with an expression of the most profound contempt, he flung the card from him on the table of the House." "The House," says the same witness, "was literally 'struck of a heap.' No other phrase that I know of but that quaint, old-fashioned one can accurately describe the feeling of amazement that pervaded Parliament for some minutes after the card was thus contemptuously flung on the table." Naturally; for it was the sound of the tocsin of civil and religious liberty, not alone in England, but in the very midst of England's Senate and in the halls of England's legislature.

O'Connell, refusing to take the abominable oath, was refused his seat, and a new writ was issued for Clare only to result in a re-election. The Gordian Knot that barred the religious liberty of a people was cut in twain. There was an end of the oath, and O'Connell entered Parliament as its foremost man. Incidentally, while the fight over his admission was still being waged, he writes to a friend in London: "Have you heard of the conduct of the English Catholics towards me? They have a club here called the 'Cis-Alpine,' a bad name, you will say. They had been much divided amongst themselves, and were now about all to reunite.

I agreed to be proposed into it, when, behold! they met the day before yesterday and *black-beaned* me.

"However, I believe it has knocked up the club, as Howard, of Carby, and several others at once declared that they would never again come near it.

"Mr. Blount has behaved exceedingly well on this occasion; no man could behave better. I believe there are many of them highly indignant at the conduct of the rest; and, at all events, I heartily forgive them all. But it was a strange thing of them to do; it was a comical testimonial of my services in emancipating them. It would be well, perhaps, if I could *un-emancipate* some of them."

This was the class of Catholics against whom Bishop Milner had to contend so strongly; and, as recent events have shown, England is not yet rid of them.

Stress has been laid upon this portion of the correspondence, for, after all, the conquest of Catholic Emancipation was at once the turning-point and the crowning-point in O'Connell's career. After that great conquest, which opened the way to all the reforms and redresses since gained for Ireland, and none of which were absent from his mind and plan for the regeneration of his country, the Liberator, as he was justly titled, entered into and became a power in imperial politics. He resented the confirmed idea that Ireland was a mere province of England. It was more than that. It was a distinct people and nation from the English, willing enough to act loyally with and under the English crown and constitution, provided that that crown and constitution acted loyally, and as became a civilized government, towards the Irish people. England, under the combined persuasion of Gladstone and of Parnell and their followers, is coming to realize the force and the truth of the stand taken by O'Connell. His purpose was to create a real union of amity and comity between England and Ireland, and to abolish the unreal union that was born in corruption and maintained by cruelty and force of arms. That is the purpose of the Irish leaders and of the Irish people to-day. His desire was to bring the Irish and the English peoples together, not by chaining and sacrificing the weaker to the stronger, but by joining hands and hearts in community of interests.

And here, to drop the correspondence a moment, is it not strange—to use the mildest expression—that a great power like England should persistently persevere in maiming its right arm? For Ireland is, or surely might be, made the right arm of England. It ought to be clear by this time, even to the dullest English mind, that the Irish people are not, never were, and can never consent to be, British helots; hewers of wood, drawers of water to a cruel

and merciless power—a nation butchered to make an English holiday. The Irish people do not ask for separation from England. They ask only for their inalienable right of looking after their own affairs, a right conceded to the English colonies. If they are driven into conspiracy against English dominion, on which side lies the blame? In “Lothair” Disraeli, who lived and grew to become one of England’s most powerful and astute premiers, exposed the workings of the modern secret societies in Europe. In some respects the romance, or whatever it may be called, was an outrage on Catholics. But if it be true that “the devil can cite scripture for his purpose,” it is equally true that the devil is sometimes forced to speak the truth in spite of himself. In all the countries where the chief agent of the secret societies was working to create a general uprising and the overthrow of everything existing in order to return to the worship of *Madre Natura*, he paused at Ireland. The revolutionary spirit the Irish had, and cause for it, but not the revolution he desired. There was no *Madre Natura*, no mother-nature worship for them. “The priest, the priest,” stood in the gap. What a testimony from such a man to the power of Catholic truth on a loyal Catholic people! And yet, through all O’Connell’s correspondence it is seen that the Catholic Church, the Catholic faith, the Catholic prelate or priest, the Catholic Irish, are the nightmare of the Crown and of the successive Tory ministries. In point of fact, to be a Catholic was to be a criminal and an enemy of the state. The small Orange patch in Ireland received all the favor of the crown and of the authorities; the Catholic people were, as of old, the “mere Irish” without the pale. Much as Ireland has advanced in civil and religious freedom since those dark days, the same vicious tradition prevails on the part of the Crown and the government. When Mr. Gladstone proposed the disestablishment of the Anglican Church in Ireland, the Orange faction rose and declared that if the measure were passed they would kick the Queen’s crown into the Boyne. The measure was passed in the face both of Orangeism and Toryism. There was a strong Orange conspiracy, of which the correspondence treats, against the very accession of the Queen to the throne, an accession which O’Connell hailed with delight as introducing a new order and a liberal reign. His allusions to the Queen are frequent and most loyal, affectionate, even, in their expression. Were he living to-day he might possibly take on a different tone. It is the same Queen who, in a speech from the throne inspired by Lord Salisbury, insisted that measures should be taken to protect her “loyal people” in Ireland—the Orange faction: the loyal people who conspired against her accession and threatened to kick her crown into the Boyne if she dared give her sanction to the abolishing of one

of the grossest abuses that ever existed. It was to the passions of these same loyal people that the Tories appealed when Mr. Gladstone introduced his measure for the better government of Ireland. It was this loyal people who declared that even if the measure were passed and became law they would never obey it, but fight to the death against it. This faction, this fraction of the Irish population, have been encouraged by successive governments in the belief that they are a law unto themselves. And to fan their passions at a passionate time went over the Tory Lord Randolph Churchill, whose mission resulted in deplorable riot and bloodshed; and as though he had not done harm enough, Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, once supposed to be a Radical leader, but who deserted Mr. Gladstone when that great statesman presented his measure for the better government of Ireland, followed in Churchill's wake for the same despicable purpose of fomenting, instead of allaying, disorder.

It will be seen from all this how truly history repeats itself, especially in the relations between England and Ireland. O'Connell tried hard to win over the Orange faction to reason, justice and patriotism. In this he failed utterly, as Parnell has failed. He turned from them to Protestant and liberal England. There he succeeded much better; for the English, though slow to move out of old ruts, and slow as a people to grasp a new idea, when they do move, move once for all. They have been moving in the right direction ever since O'Connell awakened their senses and set them thinking and going. Mr. Parnell has caught and nobly wrought on the same idea. The liberation of Ireland is to come from England. It cannot be won by force of arms. Appeal to force of arms, secret or open, O'Connell always deprecated and condemned, at a time when Ireland had nine and not four millions of inhabitants. His appeal was to reason, to justice, to the Constitution of England. That is the appeal of Mr. Parnell. Since first the English crossed the Channel and gained a footing in Ireland, there began a war of race, to which, on the apostacy of the English crown and nation, was added a war of religion. Both in race and religion the Irish have through centuries proved themselves invincible. All the power of England has been exerted for centuries to crush the soul, the life, the faith out of the Irish people. The Irish people have contributed mightily to the growth of England's power. They have given her statesmen; they have given her generals; they have given her armies; they have given her lights in law and literature. And in return England has given this loyal and noble people—what? Coercion and starvation. Is it not time to change this policy, and win rather than antagonize such a people?

That question may be left to the contemplation of the English nation and English statesmen. Would it not be better, from any point of view, for England to have a contented and prosperous Ireland at her side, hand in hand with her, rather than a discontented and impoverished people? Ranters of note have said before, and say to-day, that the Irish are not fitted for self-government. Mr. James Anthony Froude is one of these. They are certainly not fitted for the government which England has given them, a far worse and harsher government than that from which the North American colonies broke away to create the United States. A people who can produce O'Connells and Parnells, men who can call up and keep together parties strong enough to hold the balance between the rival parties in England, surely shows power of self-government. Mr. Parnell and his brilliant band of followers have for years been driving O'Connell's coach and six, not through acts of Parliament alone, but through Parliament itself; and all the world testifies to the consummate skill of the present Irish leader, who has had to endure the same calumnies, the same assaults on every side, the same difficulties and dangers as O'Connell. He has met them and overcome them. His complete victory over the aspersions of the *London Times*, which was only in this matter a mouthpiece and organ of a treacherous government, has made a profound impression on England. O'Connell had to endure the most ferocious attacks from the same *Times*, under the kinsmen of the present proprietor. When the *Times* attacks the Irish leaders with such calculated virulence, it is simply attacking the Irish people. The press throughout the world must rejoice at the exposure of a great journal which places a premium on fraud and frauds. But what of the government which uses it for that very purpose?

The last days of O'Connell were clouded. His heart was with his people, to whom famine came; that fearful famine that decimated the country and formed a more powerful argument than even his genius had conceived against English rule in Ireland. His correspondence reveals to us a most beautiful and unselfish character; a character, indeed, unique in history. History he made and unmade, but always in the direction of freedom, religion and light. His life was full of good as well as of great deeds. The most pious expressions run naturally through his letters. Some of those letters, written in the pressure of great events, to members of his family, are worthy of a St. Francis de Sales. His death was a holy death. His last days were given to prayer and devotion. To his country he gave all that God gave to him. And the altar of Ireland's resurrection will be built on O'Connell.

THE JESUIT ESTATES IN CANADA.

Memoire sur les Biens des Jesuites en Canada, par un Jesuite. Montreal, 1874.
 Jesuits' Estates. Answer to . . . the *Montreal Star*. By U. E. L.

SOME of the papers in this country and in Canada, with a small portion of the population in the neighboring Dominion, have recently been exerting their utmost efforts to environ with religious prejudice a question in itself simple and easy of solution. This was the final disposition by the Canadian government of certain large estates which had passed from the hands of the British government to the hands of the provinces; estates which had been held by a strange tenure and were a constant source of discussion and debate.

While the people of Canada, with a slight military force from France, were endeavoring to hold the province against England and her colonies at the south, Louis XV., through his parliaments, drove the members of the Society of Jesus from their houses, confiscated their property, and exiled most of the members. The failure of the French arms left Canada in the possession of England, before the French authorities could enforce their decrees there.

By the surrender of Montreal, Amherst guaranteed the people liberty to exercise their religion, and the treaty of peace extended this to all parts of Canada. England, however, made one restriction. While the religious orders of women, the Ursulines and Hospital Nuns, Sisters of the Congregation, and Mme. d'Youville's Sisters of Charity were left free to pursue the work appropriate to each institute, the Jesuits and Recollects, or Reformed Franciscans, then in Canada were not viewed with as much favor, and their future hung in the uncertain scales of doubt.

Amherst refused to agree to the proposition that the Jesuits, Sulpicians and Recollects should retain their property, and the Jesuits and Sulpicians should continue to present to certain parishes, as they had hitherto done. It is left in doubt whether both clauses or only the latter was objected to. The fact is that the three communities were left in possession of their property, and the Sulpicians have never been disquieted.

The capitulation, however, gave the religious communities the right to sell their landed property, if they preferred to leave the colony. As it had guaranteed by the 33d article that all the re-

ligious communities and all priests should retain the right of property and enjoyment of the seigneuries and other estates possessed by them in the colony, the right to sell covered the whole ground.

The treaty of Paris granted the liberty of the Catholic religion to the inhabitants of Canada, and allowed those who preferred to leave the colony to sell their estates within eighteen months, but required that they be sold to British subjects. It may be asked whether this necessarily included the religious communities. On this point there can be no doubt, for Martinique, like Canada, passed into the hands of England during this same war, and was given up by France. There the Jesuits actually sold their property after the island had passed under the British flag.

During the war some of the Jesuit property was occupied by the British authorities, including part of their college at Quebec, but this was simply to meet the exigencies of military occupation, and affected no rights of property.

The territory west of the Mississippi was retained by France, and there the acts of the French parliaments against the Jesuits were copied and enforced. The Louisiana authorities seized all the Jesuit property, and not only that, but some of their over-zealous officials crossed the Mississippi and pretended to seize and sell the property of the Society of Jesus at Kaskaskia and even at Vincennes, although these little towns were on British soil, and no longer subject to the French crown. The territory northwest of the Ohio was not at first governed by England as part of Canada, but made a military district under General Gage. That commander and his officers treated the Louisiana sale as a nullity, which it really was, but as there was no Jesuit Father in possession they occupied and held it.

In Canada the greater part of the property was left in the hands of the members of the Society of Jesus. Their title to the whole of their estates was recognized and undisputed. Whatever revenue arose from these was received by them and expended for the objects to which it had always been applied, the maintenance of the Catholic religion, the instruction of youth and the Indian missions. Before the Church and before the world there was nothing to alter their relations to the property which they had so long, and as history proves, so beneficially administered. In 1773, Pope Clement XIV. by his brief suppressed the Society of Jesus, and made the members, as secular priests, subject to the bishops of the diocese where they happened to be, and by the laws of the Church the bishops were to administer the property, as ecclesiastical goods, for the objects intended in the original grant or purchase, or to which they had been habitually applied.

Wherever this brief was formally promulgated by the bishop of

the diocese, and the members of the Society gave in their adhesion, the bishops, as a rule, entered into possession of the property, allowing each member of the society during life an annual amount for his decent and proper support and maintenance. In all Catholic countries the brief was formally promulgated. In Prussia and Russia the government forbade the Catholic bishops to promulgate or enforce it. In England the Vicars-Apostolic promulgated it, and Bishop Challoner, Vicar-Apostolic of the London district, promulgated it, not only in the part of England subject to his jurisdiction, but also in Maryland and Pennsylvania, where the missionaries of the Society signed a document expressing their adhesion to the brief; but probably, not being diocesan bishops, they nowhere took possession of the property.

But in Canada it was never promulgated. The Bishop of Quebec, by the advice and direction of Lord Dorchester, then governor, took no steps in the matter; the Fathers of the Society were not called upon to accept the brief or dissolve. He explained his reasons to the Holy See, and his action was not censured. They remained Jesuits as they did in Prussia and Russia, where in time their continuing to live under their rule and enjoy their property was expressly sanctioned by the Holy See. In the law of the Catholic Church the brief did not in any respect alter the condition of the Jesuits in Canada.

The College of Quebec was maintained till 1776, when the British authorities in Canada deemed it necessary for the public service, during the war between England and the States which had declared their independence, to occupy some of the buildings belonging to the Jesuits. Most of the college at Quebec was used by them for the archives of the province; the house at Three Rivers for a prison, and on the death of Father Well at Montreal the house there was also used for government purposes.

These acts were not in pursuance of any act of parliament or of any legal process, but were simply such acts as are often done under the plea of military necessity.

The famous Quebec Act of 1774 had indeed excepted the religious orders and communities from the guarantee by which the Canadian people and clergy were declared enabled to hold their property and possessions, notwithstanding any acts, proclamations, commissions or ordinances.

The effect of this exception in the Quebec Act could not divest any one of property. No such result can follow from implication. At most it made the Quebec Act inoperative in favor of the Jesuits' title to their estates, leaving them to maintain their rights on such other grounds as they might have.

Even the English government recognized the fact that the

Jesuit estates in Canada had not passed out of the hands of the Society, for when Lord Amherst applied, in 1787, for a grant of part of these lands, the English Privy Council, which has seldom been reluctant to bestow on favorites of the crown any estates to which the king might have the most shadowy title, positively refused.

The British officials in Canada, not under any law or act of parliament, prohibited the Jesuits from receiving any novices or members from other countries. Indeed, they carried this so far that when, after the conquest of Canada, Father Hunter visited Canada from Maryland, which was passing from one British province to another, he was not permitted to remain, but was at once ordered to leave the province.

Unable to maintain their body either by receiving novices or members from Russia, where the Society existed, the Jesuits in Canada became a kind of Tontine association, the property vesting in the survivors till finally all was held by Father Casot, who died in 1800, having enjoyed to the last the income of all seigneuries and property not occupied by government under pretext of military or other necessity of the public service.

Father Casot either held these estates as an individual subject or as ecclesiastical property. If they belonged absolutely to him, they went under the treaty of Paris to his heirs, or in default of heirs escheated to the crown. If he held them in trust for pious uses as ecclesiastical property, the state could not, without violating the capitulations and the treaty of Paris, confiscate them. It was bound to take steps to see that the income should be applied as it had been for more than a century, that is, to the maintenance of Catholic worship, the education of youth and the support of Indian missions. By the law of the Catholic Church the Bishop of Quebec, whose diocese then embraced all Canada, was the proper person and only person to administer this property and apply the revenues.

The Bishop of Quebec had not been silent. Mgr. Briand addressed the king on the matter of the Jesuit estates, when Lord Amherst's application was known. "I asked their preservation for the good of the colony," he wrote. "It was only this view that made me, when in London, so earnestly ask their preservation; from the same motives mentioned last year, after explaining at length my sentiments on the question to your Excellency, to present to his Gracious Majesty, George III., our sovereign, a petition tending to the same end. But what has been my surprise and grief when I learned that they not only aimed to destroy the Jesuits, but proposed to wrest from the Church their estates even, consecrated to God and religion. . . . Was it not natural to confide to the seminary, now in

charge of the college, the property which belonged to the college maintained by the Jesuits, if they are not allowed to exist?"

Father Glapion, the Superior of the Jesuits, had in 1788, before a commission instituted to examine what right the crown had to the Jesuit estates, boldly claimed that the Society was absolutely entitled to its estates by gift from the French crown, from individuals and by purchase. That as a body corporate they could hold, was evident from the fact that a patent of Louis XIV., in 1678, recognized and so declared.

The commission could not, and apparently did not, find that the estates had vested in the crown; and it was deemed best to make a step in the matter in an indirect way, and on the royal instructions of September 16th, 1791, this clause was inserted: It is our will and pleasure "that the Society of Jesus be suppressed and dissolved, and no longer continued as a body corporate or politic, and all their possessions and property shall be vested in us for such purposes as we may hereafter think fit to direct and appoint; but we think fit to declare our royal intention to be, that the present members of the said Society, as established at Quebec, shall be allowed sufficient stipends and provisions during their natural lives."

This was in direct violation of the capitulation of Montreal, recognizing the Jesuits and authorizing them to sell their property, and of the treaty of Paris. And it is not easy to see how, under English systems of law, a mere paragraph in royal instructions to a colonial governor could deprive an individual or a corporation of its property.

In point of fact the clause remained a dead letter, and no action was taken till the death of Father Casot. When that event occurred the government took possession of the property; the question is, whether rightfully or wrongfully. Every fair-minded person must admit that it was wrongfully. The estates did not escheat by the death of Father Casot, without legal heirs; for it was not his individual property. The Society of Jesus held and administered it as ecclesiastical property, for known and recognized objects; it was part of the property of the Catholic Church in Canada.

No act of parliament was passed vesting it in the crown, and the introduction of such a statute would have excited more prolonged debates than those on the Quebec Act, when the right of the Jesuits to hold their property and even sell it, if they left the colony, was fully recognized.

The government in Canada took possession of the property without defining in any way by what tenure they held it. Their discreet silence could not alter facts or make it in their hands any the less ecclesiastical property of the Catholic Church. Government was bound to apply the income as it had been applied. The Eng-

lish penal laws had no force in Canada and could not affect the case.

The British rulers in Canada took pains to make the income small. The total revenue from 1800 to 1831 was \$193,334.85, and the expenses \$188,973.46, so that only some three hundred dollars a year found its way to the treasury! What was expended from this property of the Catholic Church in Canada was given solely and exclusively to Protestant churches and institutions. Between 1818 and 1827, \$39,152.57 was given to Protestant churches; \$49,481.38 to royal grammar schools (Protestant) at Quebec, Montreal and Kingston. Other amounts were paid to Protestant clergymen, and it is of common repute in Canada that for some years a salary was paid to a gentleman who came highly recommended from England, but for whom no place could be found, till some one, with more ingenuity than conscience, suggested creating the office of chaplain to the Jesuit estates, and the gentleman was accordingly installed with a comfortable salary!

The Catholic bishops of Canada were not indifferent spectators of this spoliation of the Church and perversion of its revenues, but after the conquest of Canada they found the English government indisposed to carry out the treaty, and as British subjects they could not appeal to the French government to demand of England a just and honest execution of the capitulations and treaty. They were helpless, and found a deaf ear turned to all their appeals for justice; and, as we have seen, were forced to behold the property of the Catholic Church used to support Protestant churches, schools and ministers, for not a cent of this Catholic revenue was ever granted to any Catholic bishop, church, institution or clergyman.

At a time when the project of a mixed university was mooted in Canada, Bishop Hubert (November 18th, 1789), in a forcible letter to the Hon. William Smith, Chief Justice of Quebec, set forth the claim of the Church to the old Jesuit college, then used as a barrack for troops, and made a claim for means from the Jesuit estates to restore and maintain that institution and develop it into a university, as well as to support and extend the Indian missions, in which he took a personal interest, having been himself stationed in Detroit and Illinois. But the appeal was unheeded. At a subsequent period, Bishop Joseph Signay, of Quebec, with his coadjutor Bishop Turgeon and Bishop Lartigue, then suffragan, and in time first Bishop of Montreal, addressed a petition to the provincial parliament of Lower Canada, in which they said: "Your petitioners humbly considering that the Society of Jesus being extinct in this country, their natural successors as to the

object of their institute are the Catholic bishops of the diocese. The crown having transferred this property to the province to be applied according to its original destination, the undersigned believe that they are entitled to claim the administration of this property as Church property.

"Your petitioners therefore humbly ask that the administration of the said property be confided to the bishops under such conditions as the legislature may impose," etc.

This appeal was fruitless, and in January, 1845, the Archbishop of Quebec, the Bishops of Montreal and Kingston, and their coadjutors, and the Bishop of Toronto, addressed the legislature. They recited that the government had for forty-four years preserved intact the Jesuit property and had now, influenced doubtless by a feeling of justice and equity, transferred it to the provincial legislature to be employed in promoting education; then they proceeded to declare that "the Catholic Church in Canada had a right to claim that this property should be transferred to them to be employed according to its primitive destination, as besides the education to be afforded to Canadians, the donors and acquirers of this property had other objects in view, such as the propagation of the Catholic faith among the Indians, the offering of Masses, etc., objects which cannot be fulfilled without the ministry of the Catholic bishops.

The clergy of the dioceses of Quebec and Montreal also in 1847 addressed the parliament, claiming that this property belonged of right to the Catholic Church and should be restored to it. Similar appeals were made by the Archbishop of Quebec, and his suffragans in 1878, and by the Archbishop in 1885.

It will thus be seen that the Church constantly and persistently put forward its claim to the property as exclusive owner, illegally and wrongfully deprived of the due enjoyment of what under the treaty of Paris belonged to it.

Meanwhile, changes had taken place in the position of affairs. The Society of Jesus, recognized in Russia, was re-established throughout the world by Pope Pius VII., in 1814, and the General in Russia was approved as General of the Order, by the Sovereign Pontiff, who restored to the body such houses in the Pontifical States as were held by government. The Society spread. The old province of France revived, and in 1842 it sent a colony to resume the labors of the Society in Canada, where the Fathers were warmly welcomed. They founded St. Mary's College and a fine church at Montreal, residences at Quebec, Three Rivers and in Upper Canada, revived their Indian missions, and have, within a few years, established a second college at St. Boniface, Manitoba. All this was not accomplished without great cost and outlay, and

they naturally began to feel, amid their struggles for the good of religion in Canada, that the property of the old mission should be restored to them to continue and extend their work which was identical with that carried on by their predecessors, and for which the property had been originally acquired.

In 1873, a question arose in the legislature in regard to the old Jesuit college at Quebec, known of late years by the somewhat odd title of Jesuit Barracks; for though the government could place soldiers there, it could not drive from the mind of the Catholic Canadians the fact that it really belonged to the Jesuits. On this occasion, Mr. David, one of the members, asked the Ministry whether in disposing of this building it had any intention of making compensation to the original owners. The whole question was thus opened, and has since been an object of discussion in Canada.

On the Protestant side a small but active and bigoted body resisted any attempt to restore the Jesuit estates, or any part of them, to the Catholic Church, and all the usual tirades against the Church and the Jesuits were resorted to. It was claimed that they were really government property, and that the Jesuits had been suppressed; that the rights of the bishops had lapsed, and that the Jesuits now in Canada could not claim succession to the members of the former mission. In fact, that as this property, rightly or wrongly, had been used for years for the benefit of Protestant churches and institutions, the system ought to continue.

Among Catholics there was also a division of opinion. Some held that by the brief of Clement XIV., even though not promulgated, a right of property vested in the Bishop of Quebec, and that his failure or inability to take possession did not in the eye of the Church impair their right. The Laval University and the Seminary of Quebec, which took up the work of the old Jesuit college and had done so much for higher education, also made a claim to some portion of the estates.

The Fathers of the Society applied to the Sovereign Pontiff for authority to petition for a restoration of the property, or an equivalent for it. A Papal indult, issued April 19th, 1871, gave the General of the Order the authority, and Father Turgeon, as delegate of the General, took steps to make a formal appeal to the government in Canada.

The Papal indult, placed in the hands of the procurator of the Jesuits, enabled them to give a legal discharge or receipt in full to the Province of Quebec for the property, and so ease the public conscience by putting an end to a great wrong. When the money which might be agreed upon as compensation is paid by the government, the Society of Jesus cannot appropriate to its own use

any part thereof till the highest authority in the Church decides on the disposition to be made of it.

The indult, we may say, gave a definite person the right to appear as plaintiff in the case, as representing the Society of Jesus and the Catholic Church.

The case was at once taken up and pursued steadily. Mr. Mercier, Prime Minister of the Province of Quebec, at last introduced a bill to pay \$400,000 in settlement of all claims of the Church and the Society of Jesus to the estates in question. It was but a small percentage of the actual value, and took no account of the income received during the present century. So far as the government was concerned, it was settling an old and valid claim on very easy terms by a compromise. Such settlements are not unknown even south of the St. Lawrence. The Common Council of the city of New York once gave a Presbyterian church the block between Nassau Street, Park Row, and Beekman Street, to be occupied exclusively for a church. A brick church, with attendant buildings, was erected there and maintained for many years; but in time the congregation moved farther up town. The church was not needed by the Presbyterian body, but service was kept up *pro forma*, and the annexed buildings were rented out in part or in whole. At last the Brick Presbyterian church corporation made a compromise with the city. If they closed the church or attempted to sell the property they lost all rights. As long as they held on the city could not dispossess them. It was finally agreed that the property should be sold, and that part of the proceeds go to the treasury of the city of New York, and the rest to the corporation of the Brick Presbyterian church.

There was no denunciation by Catholics or Catholic journals of this compromise, nor did the Catholic papers resound with accusations against the Presbyterian body.

The bill introduced into the Quebec legislature under the auspices of Mr. Mercier recited at length the whole history of the question, enumerated the petitions and claims of the Canadian bishops, the action of the Jesuits, the sanction given them at Rome to petition the Quebec government, and the whole negotiation between Father Turgeon as procurator of the Society and the Ministry; the claim of Father Turgeon for one-half of one of the estates which the Society had purchased, and the final decision of the minister not to go beyond \$400,000, as that amount had once been named in behalf of the Church.

The act itself was short, and provided for the appropriation of \$400,000 to remain in the provincial treasury till the Pope ratified the settlement, and made known his wishes respecting the distribution of the amount within the Province of Quebec.

Some objection was made to the introduction of the Pope and his government in the preamble, but when it was explained that as this was a settlement with the Church, the action of the head of the Church must necessarily appear to make the action final, the adverse action was withdrawn.

The act passed the Quebec legislature with very little opposition and became a law.

But the question did not end there. An act of a local legislature in Canada may be vetoed. The battle had to be fought again at Ottawa, where the rights of the Catholic Church, and especially of the Jesuits, were not likely to appeal strongly to the conscience of all men. The floodgates were at once let loose. The newspapers teemed with charges, and the agents of the Associated Press, who seem to be selected for their gross ignorance and grosser prejudice against everything Catholic, flooded the papers in the United States with dishonest telegrams.

One old calumny, started when Canadian history was but little known, was revived, when to repeat it convicted the writer either of wanton bad faith or of utter ignorance of the history of the province at a time when public and private libraries teem with books and manuscripts for every year of Canada's annals. The charge was that the Jesuits acquired much of their property by wronging the Indians, and it was gravely asserted that they had deprived the Hurons of Lorette of the seignury of Sillery, to which the tribe was justly entitled. Years ago this claim was presented to the legislature of Lower Canada, and a bill introduced for the relief of the Hurons. The Hon. D. B. Viger had been detained from attending by illness; when he arrived, and learned of the bill and the favor shown it by many members, he upbraided them with their ignorance of the history of the colony. Hurons at Sillery! The Hurons never were at Sillery, and never had the slightest claim to it. He soon convinced the house, and the subject was dropped. There were in those days few libraries in Canada. Mr. Faribault had but just begun his work, and there might be some excuse or palliation for the ignorance of members, but for the press of Canada or the United States to repeat the story in the year 1889, is to show a state of ignorance utterly incomprehensible and disgraceful. The "*Relations des Jésuites*" were reprinted several years ago at Quebec; Charlevoix's "*History of New France*" is accessible in French and English. In these alone, without referring to other works, the history of the Sillery mission may be traced. The "*Relations*" show that the seignury was acquired by the Christian charity of Noel Brulart de Sillery, Knight of Malta, for the purpose of establishing a mission there

for the Algonquins; that the mission was maintained at Sillery exclusively for the Algonquins for several years; and that no Hurons were settled there. In time the wars with the Iroquois, the scarcity of game, and disease thinned the little body of Christian Algonquins, and a party of Abnakis from the Kennebec were received there. These were followed by others of the same tribe, and it became mainly an Abnaki mission. The transition was easy, as Algonquin and Abnaki spoke dialects of the same widespread language, whereas the Hurons spoke a radically different language.

In time the land became exhausted, and the Jesuit Fathers removed the Indians to Rivière du Loup, and finally to St. François, where the remnant of this old Sillery mission remains. At no time were Hurons at Sillery or the subsequent stations. Yet this shallow falsehood has gone the rounds of a press which prides itself on its intelligence!

More coarse and conscienceless was the Canadian journal that published a spurious oath which its editor pretended every Jesuit took, disavowing allegiance to any temporal government, and promising to do no end of wicked and shameful acts. Against this paper the Jesuits promptly brought a suit for libel.

In the Dominion parliament Colonel O'Brien, the leader of the strong anti-Catholic organizations in Ontario, introduced a measure to prevent the sanction of the Act passed at Quebec. Dalton McCarthy, another member, also spoke in favor of disallowance, but the leading men of Canada, Sir John Macdonald, Edward Blake, Sir John Thompson, Alexander Mackenzie, sustained the action of the Quebec legislature, and the act was sustained by a vote of 188 to 13.

The Dominion Evangelical Alliance, the Presbytery of Montreal and others had petitioned the Privy Council of the Dominion to recall its recommendation that the Act should be left to its operation, but the Council, in reply to each and all, declined to do so.

They talk of appealing to the queen; but some sense of self-respect must exist among them.

So far as Canada is concerned, the whole question is settled. A great moral wrong has been redressed. An historic body, whose labors and services in the cause of education and science, in the cause of Christian evangelization among the Indian tribes from the Gulf of St. Lawrence to the shadow of the Rocky Mountains, holding life as naught, were rewarded by oppression and rapine, receives a full and complete justification.

A comparatively small amount is restored to the Church. Under the decision of the Holy See, only a part will go to aid the

Society of Jesus in meeting the debts incurred in its work for the benefit of Canada; the rest in the hands of the Canadian bishops will be devoted to pious uses.

The old Jesuit college at Quebec was an eye-sore to many, and at last an order was obtained for its demolition on the ground that it had become insecure and dangerous, and might at any moment fall on the heads of people passing along the street. Against this act of vandalism the bishops of the province protested plainly, and experts declared that the walls were perfectly sound and safe, that the pretended fears were purely chimerical.

But in spite of remonstrance it was determined to remove the ancient Catholic landmark in the city of Champlain. The work of demolishing the old Jesuit structure began in May, 1877. The workmen found the stone and mortar of the walls blended into a mass like wrought iron. All through the year they toiled till winter stopped their operations. In the spring the work was resumed, and explosives were employed to level the walls which had been declared to be so dangerous; and it was not till far into the year 1879 that the government succeeded in leveling to the earth the building where so many Canadian explorers and officers had been trained, and from whose portals so many heroic missionaries had gone forth to their noble work.

Faucher de St. Maurice, an eminent literary man, discovered vaults containing evidently the remains of some of the early Jesuits. Before he could arrange for their removal, they were surreptitiously abstracted. In a "Relation," eloquent with tenderness and feeling, he raised a monument to the ancient structure.

This episode betrays the un-Christian character of the whole opposition to the claim of the Church.

TRIPLE ORDER OF SCIENCE—PHYSICS, METAPHYSICS AND FAITH.

IN a previous article we called attention to a triple order of science. It has been said that that article seemed to belittle the efforts of conscientious investigators in physical science. Nothing could have been farther from its intention. Its purpose was to note the evil done, in the name of "Science," by those who do not recognize the triple order, and who try to obliterate the clearly drawn lines of division between physics, metaphysics and faith. We return to this subject of the boundary lines, since a very definite knowledge of the place of physics is the key to the abundant sophistry that is palmed off upon the public as science.

Physics (taking in the whole range of physical science) has nothing to do with first causes or final causes. It deals exclusively with matter. Its province does not go beyond material phenomena. By observation and repeated experiment it tries to discover the general laws that regulate the action of the material universe. It proceeds upon the axiom that the laws of nature are constant. As physics, it does not embrace the cases in which there may be a deviation from the known constancy of action in the forces of nature. Physics,—material science,—so long as it keeps to its domain, pursues a rigorous method. It is perfectly logical; and we may subscribe in advance, as philosophers and theologians, to all the conclusions which it draws legitimately in its own sphere. It refers material phenomena to their immediate causes. But it has nothing to do with essence, prime origin or final destiny. In so far as it goes, it can give us real certainty. But we must be on our guard to distinguish carefully what is *certain* from certain preconceived conclusions which physics does not, cannot demonstrate, and which we know from other sources to be not only undemonstrable, but utterly false. In the controversy of our day the comparatively youthful science of geology plays a very important part. It affords us—to be liberal with it—a clear demonstration of the great antiquity of our globe; of the existence of an azoic or lifeless period before the organic period; of progressive succession in the forms of life; and of man's comparatively recent appearance. Besides this definite certainty with regard to some things, geology has its hypotheses which bear an air of probability; and some of its probabilities are becoming daily more settled by the discovery of new facts. Still, probability is only probability, and

must be treated as such. So long as it does not contradict *certain* principles, we must allow it to pass as *probability*. But we cannot allow it to be forced upon us as certainty; nor will we admit as certainty any conclusion that is drawn from it as a premise. Neither can we admit that because all laws of physics were once held as hypotheses, all existing hypotheses are to be regarded as so many future laws. The changes that twenty-five years have wrought in fundamental chemistry should suffice to make us prudent in our use and advocacy of physical hypotheses.

Whilst recognizing seriously in the interest of truth the authority of material science, we should cultivate the critical habit of rejecting the dreams of that class of "scientists" who do not adhere to the true method of material science, which is purely experimental, but who jump at conclusions with "missing links"; who are too ready to emancipate themselves from the laws of lawful induction; who, without analyzing their own synthesis, make assertions that overleap their experiment; who parade as truth what is sometimes only comical hypothesis; and who discourse on essence, cause, origin and finality as if—well, as if they were metaphysicians. From the literature of material science we might gather a library of hasty conclusions, rash assertions and wrecked hypotheses. And in our day there is manifested a daring, truly homeric, to prop up pet theories with *facts* of which there is no record. We should not say that it is never allowable to make the supposition of a fact for the purpose of testing a theory. But we protest against proclaiming as laws, theories that are based on such presumptions.

As an illustration of hypothetical geology, we summarize from a work on the antiquity of man, by M. de Mortillet, Professor at the Paris School of Anthropology. He wishes to prove the scriptural age of man absurd. He bases his conclusion upon four hypotheses. He boldly fixes the exact proportion of the prehistoric ages. Then by hypothesis of identity between the glacial and another period, fixes the duration of this, even in his mind, indefinite period at 100,000 years. Finally, he says, when *we know* this duration to have been 100,000 years, we can put the appearance of man on the earth at between 230,000 and 240,000 years ago. This is but one example in a thousand. The hypothetical biology of Mr. Haeckel is just as interesting. His method of doing away with the fiction of a spiritual or even an immaterial soul may be reduced to the following: (1) To assume the existence of the organic molecule, which he calls plastidule, with its own soul (mechanical force); (2) to assume that the reunion of these little plastidular souls makes the soul (mechanical force) of the cellule; (3) to assume that the reunion of these cellular souls (forces)

makes what people have agreed to call the "soul" in an organized being, whether animal, plant or man; (4) to assume that the more complex functions called thought, intelligence, reason, being exerted especially in the brain, the brain has, therefore, privileged plastidules or organic molecules which form psychic cellules. If your curiosity prompts you to go back to the beginning to see what, after all, are those original little molecular souls, you will find that they are only an undulatory, rhythmic, ramified motion, dependent on atomic mechanism. *Satis.*

But to come nearer home and to use an illustration that will serve as one for all: When was there ever a theory that so came to take the intellectual world by very storm as the theory of evolution. What theory has ever been so importunately forced into notice. We who were disposed to be incredulous were told that we knew nothing of the facts; that we might pass our time more profitably in going through the storehouse of science than in presuming to reject untried the discoveries of science. And if we laughed at the anti-climax of the theory—the rubbing off of the tail—we were little better than arch-heretics, so ignorant, forsooth, that ridicule was the only argument we could bring against the dogmas of "science." Well, to be sure, as the researches were new, and in novel lines, the only policy we had to pursue was to be silent, to read, to watch, to note the facts of discovery, to demand in every instance the tests required for the formulating of a law. And what has been the result? Only this, that the evolution theory started without a fact and has ended without a fact. The storehouse of nature has been simply ransacked to find one fact. And we, though laymen in "science," know that the constancy of a fact under every variety of condition is required to establish a physical law. It might be answered that the evolution of varieties of life was advanced only as something fortuitous. Well, even for this fortuitous evolution not one fact is forthcoming. On the contrary, whatever has been discovered only confirms the doctrine of the creation of species. For though the record on the rocks shows us that, as time advanced, the types of life increased in number and elevation, and became more specific, the very same record shows that the types, at their first appearance, appeared at their best, and *if* they changed, that they changed only to degenerate and thus to become extinct, but never to advance to a higher type. We know of no one who has meditated more seriously upon the evolutionist philosophy than has Sir J. W. Dawson. He says, "it has been well characterized as the 'baldest of all the philosophies which have sprung up in our world.'" He continues: "that in our day a system destitute of any shadow of proof, and supported merely by vague analogies and figures of speech, and by the arbitrary and

artificial coherence of its own parts, should be accepted as a philosophy and should find able adherents to string upon its thread of hypotheses our vast and weighty stores of knowledge, is surpassingly strange."¹ Sir J. W. Dawson does not, as we do not, deny or undervalue the physical research that has been made. How could he without misapprehending the fact of his own life? To conclude, therefore, "Evolution" is a hypothesis. It rests upon another hypothesis—that of the missing links. The hypothesis of the missing links is made to satisfy the other hypothesis of evolution. Thus the whole theory is an assumption based on an assumption. Even as regards the Trilobites of the Devonian, which are forced into the semblance of an argument for evolution, Barrande, the celebrated Bohemian palæontologist, has traced their history and shown that they are, *if* an argument, a very clear one against the theory of the derivation of species.

So much for hypothesis. At the Anthropologic Congress, held in Germany in 1882, Virchow ventured this suggestion to the assembly, that it would be well for investigators not to draw conclusions so hastily, but to profit by sad experience and examine things twice. He advised even the relegating of hypotheses to notes, leaving the text for established facts. What a reduction in the text this would make! To conclude on this point, therefore: First: We admit all facts in advance; we encourage research; we are glad to have the record of its results; every fact known, or yet undiscovered, is in harmony with the doctrines of Christianity; there can be no opposition between truth and truth. Secondly: We reject, in advance, every theory that is in opposition with the known truth; and we object to having the discovered truths of science trimmed away so as to be forced in as paving stones upon the road to error. We turn now to a higher science, philosophy, metaphysics.

Mr. Büchner² will tell us that the deep thought of Plato, Leibnitz, Bossuet, may serve to dupe novices, but that it is only to be smiled at by scientists (as Büchner). Now how are we to reply to men who use language of this description regarding the world's recognized geniuses? What is Büchner, in his microscopic studies of dirt, to Plato, in his sublime thought? Professor Lange makes bold to insult faith and intelligence by asserting that metaphysics and religion have no objective reality.³ Do we not answer mildly when we say that Professor Lange knows nothing of either? Helmholtz beards us with the astounding declaration that our philosophy soars on the wings of Icarus (metaphysics). Is it too

¹ *The Story of the Earth and Man*, ch. 14.

³ *History of Materialism*, vol. i., p. 3.

² *Force and Matter*.

much to charge him with ignorance, to tell him that he is out of his sphere? It is one thing to be a patient and acute observer, experimenter; another thing¹ to be a philosopher. But why do we select our examples from among the Germans? Because the English and American writers of the same class are little more than copyists of the Germans. However, what do we mean by metaphysics?

Our "scientists" pride themselves upon their logic. But strange to say, they do not know that metaphysics—the general metaphysics—lies at the base of all sound logic. Metaphysics teaches us where to draw the line between the essential and the non-essential, to discriminate between substance and accident. It treats of undemonstrable first truths. It discusses the nature of cause and effect and defines the conditions necessary for the ascribing of one thing to another, as effect to cause. What is there so very childish in all this? We fear the charge falls back upon those who make it. A greater thinker than all these exponents of the "clay age" has said that all human knowledge strikes its roots in metaphysics. These "scientists," these devotees of clay, are constantly using metaphysics, though they do not know it. Whenever they strive to analyze or classify, they call to their aid some principle of metaphysics, some principle whose certainty is independent of experiment, and without which a law could never be formulated out of physical phenomena. The metaphysical principle of causality underlies the whole of physical science, which is science only in so far as it makes use of this principle. We cannot think without metaphysics. We cannot think without generalizing and classifying, and we are metaphysicians in the very act by which we would repudiate the title. Metaphysics has less need of physics than physics has of metaphysics. It is to be counted a great boon of nature that metaphysics does not entirely desert its post of mental surveillance, even in the case of the very men who abjure it.

If we turn now to a higher degree in the scale of knowledge, to the higher science, to faith, we shall find the men of the slime school—when confronted by the supernatural—only growing in bitterness, in mockery, in eagerness to asperse. This spirit of hatred for the higher knowledge has never motivated the expressions of the great men whose names remain and will remain. It was not with this predetermined spirit of hatred that those researches were undertaken which have left us the names of Copernicus, Newton, Linnæus, Ampère, Faraday, etc. However, there is much truth in the proverb about the empty wagon—that in

¹ *Critical Exposition of the Sources of Knowledge.*

passing it makes the most noise. We hear the rumble in the Congresses of Science. In the Congress of Rostock (1872), Virchow, the president, openly proclaimed that no understanding was to be had with those who believed in a spiritual soul and a positive religion; above all, none with those who professed Christianity. We have not forgotten the noise made by the address of Mr. Tyndall, when presiding at the Belfast Congress of 1874. The *Scientific American*, commenting on the Belfast address, says (September 26, 1874): "It is no longer a question of the earth's form, or position, or age, that marks the conflict of science and religion; no more is it a question of man's place in nature, his relation to other forms of life, or the origin of his physical frame; these outposts have been carried and the citadel itself is entered; the distinction between mind and matter, or matter and spirit, is denied, and with it the personal immortality of man, the personal dominion of the universe, and all that these involve." We merely remark the very pitiable arrogance of this longing *to be as the beast and no more*. Just another citation—this time from Paul Bert, a late coryphæus in his school. In a newspaper article (*Répub. Fr.*, August 31, 1881), speaking of scientific and religious teaching, he says that "the former rests upon reason, which engenders science; the latter, which is the teaching of the Church, affirms, and, in affirming, rests upon faith, the mother of superstition, and becomes, as it were fatally, the school of fanaticism and imbecility." We have here a bright example of the bad faith that is brought to the support of a bad cause. Proofs, of course, we never have to confront; nay, not even an attempt at proof. The weapons of attack are simply denial, mockery and bad language. In the onslaught upon metaphysics there is generally some outward show of argument, which in so far as it goes is but a clumsy use of metaphysics itself. But when religion is attacked, even the show of argument is usually neglected; and the whole programme is repeatedly made up of two very old numbers: 1. Aspersion by some new leader; 2. A chorus of exultation. The ignorance displayed in the attack upon metaphysics is wisdom as compared with the blindness of spirit in which men are hurried on in the war against faith. They do not recognize a defeat. They do not listen to a reply. Their whole method of meeting an adversary lies in not meeting him. It is the evasive method of Mr. Huxley, who, after asking questions about the continuance of consciousness (*i.e.*, the immortality of the soul), says: "And I am afraid that, like jesting Pilate, I shall not think it worth while (having but little time before me) to wait for an answer."¹

¹ Mr. Huxley in *Fortnightly Review*, December, 1886, p. 799.

It is not necessary here to institute an analysis of the act of faith to show the value of knowledge possessed by faith. It should be enough to know that faith rests upon evidence—an evidence more powerful to beget certainty than the evidence of experimental physics. It is the evidence of infallible authority, and there is no need of repeated experiment. A single consideration should make manifest the absurdity of the attack of pseudo-science upon faith as a basis of knowledge. For faith is based upon the evidence of Divine Revelation; and the Revelation is a historical fact. Now Strauss and Renan—master and disciple—the two most influential enemies of Christianity since the encyclopedists,—Strauss and Renan, dealing *ex professo* in history, declared that in the war against the fact of Revelation they met with defeat. They then placed the issue in the hands of materialistic experimenters. But who is there who knows the nature and scope of physical experiment, but sees the absurdity of employing it as a means to expunge historical fact? “Science” cannot destroy history. The fact of the Revelation stands, and with it the obligation of belief in the truths revealed, whether we may or may not be able to develop them with the dim light of unaided reason. The fact of Revelation has proved itself in the history of man; and the language of its opponents shows a bad cause.

It is certainly very valuable, in the pursuit of truth, to have a code of laws to guide us through intricate problems where reason even loses its way; to know from a higher authority when a position is certainly untenable, and thus be spared many a long, tedious and fruitless experience. In fact, the solid, steady advance of truly scientific thought under the guidance of dogma is patent to all but the blind. Dogma leaves absolute liberty of investigation for the unknown; but it indicates, in advance, false routes and corrects faulty hypotheses. Dogma never stands between physics and its fact. But dogma intervenes when there is question of drawing conclusions—or rather of making assertions which cannot be the result of argument; and it puts an end to those flights which are not of reason but of imagination. Yet do we find men who, rather than be guided by an unfailing authority, are willing to go to any length of contradiction. In rebellious pride they waste their lives seeking for systems that will exclude Revelation, God, Creation, and all intelligence above the visible things of the world. They catch at every vague unwarranted assertion to arm themselves against the spectre of the supersensible and supernatural. Fleeing from the light of metaphysics and of faith, they are as Voudoos before every jack-o'-lantern physical theory which can bid to lure them deeper into the darkness and the mire. The absurd situations which so-called “science” thus constantly makes

for itself in its flight from metaphysics and faith would be very laughable were they not so pitiable. Professor Borden P. Bowne has with very delicate touch characterized this—call it which you will—blindness or insincerity of modern “science.” In the preface to his work on “The Philosophy of Theism,” referring to the eagerness of some speculators to account for the order and design in the world without making mention of a superior intelligence of God, Professor Bowne says: “That nature, when driven out with a fork, always comes running back, is a discovery of ancient date. We have an excellent illustration of this law in the way in which language has avenged the attempt to discredit the teleological view of nature. Teleology has taken entire possession of the language of botany and biology, especially when expounded in the terms of evolution. Even plants do the most acute and far-sighted things to maintain their existence. They specialize themselves with a view to cross-fertilization and make nothing of changing species or genus to reach their ends. A supply is often regarded as fully explained when the need is pointed out, and evolution itself is not unfrequently endowed with mental attributes. Such extraordinary mythology arises from the necessity for recognizing purpose in the world; and as it would not be in good form to speak of a divine purpose, there is no shift but to attribute it to ‘Nature’ or ‘Evolution’ or ‘Law,’ or some other of the home-made divinities of the day” (page vii.). In the preceding paragraph, Professor Bowne had said: “Except in philosophy and theology, there is coming to be a decided conviction that no one has a right to an opinion who has not studied the subject. Off-hand decisions of unstudied questions receive very little consideration nowadays in the sciences. It is to be hoped that this mental seriousness may yet extend to philosophy and theology. At present it is not so. He would be a rare man indeed who could not settle questions in theology or Biblical criticism without previous study; while the small men who could dispose of philosophy and philosophers in one afternoon are legion.”

The following words from Sir J. W. Dawson, whilst corroborating the bold expressions of Professor Bowne, will form a very fitting conclusion to these pages: “Few of our present workers have enjoyed that thorough training in *mental* as well as physical science, which is necessary to enable men even of great powers to take large and lofty views of the scheme of nature. Hence, we often find men who are fair workers in limited departments, reasoning most illogically, taking narrow and local views, elevating the exception into the rule. . . . Such defects certainly mar much of the scientific work now being done. In the more advanced walks of scientific research, they are to some extent neutralized

by that free discussion which true science always fosters ; though even here they sometimes vexatiously arrest the progress of truth, or open floodgates of error which it will require much labor to close. But in public lectures and popular publications they run riot. To launch a clever and startling fallacy, which will float for a week and stir up a hard fight, seems almost as great a triumph as the discovery of an important fact or law."¹ A deeply significant summary of all we have been saying may be found in that very ancient text : *Scientia inflat*.

NOTES OF A CATHOLIC TOURIST IN CENTRAL EUROPE.

THERE are many objects of interest which escape the notice of most tourists, even in the well-trodden fields of central Europe. Amongst those more apt to be neglected by the multitudes of Englishmen and Americans who meet there so constantly, are those connected with the faith of their common Catholic ancestors. Sectarian prejudice has made many Englishmen so ignorant on the subject that they often fall into the grossest errors respecting the beliefs and practices of the countries they visit. Americans, whose home is necessarily devoid of mediæval remains, might be expected to be generally indifferent to relics and survivals of such old days. Nevertheless the keen interest they have displayed when their attention has been called to matters of the kind, has often surprised us. We are thus led to think that not only the Catholic readers of the AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW, but also no small number of non-Catholics may feel interest in these wayside notes. They refer to matters which we have not found elsewhere recorded, and mainly relate to matters ecclesiastical ; thus we venture also to offer a few practical hints for the comfort of those who may follow in our track.

We left London for Basle on June 17th, to anticipate the rush of summer migrants and to be in time to enjoy that prodigal display of Swiss wild flowers which precedes the mowing of its fields ; sleeping at Dover enabled us to embark leisurely for Calais and to secure a rightly directed coupé for the night journey *via* Laon. Let travellers who may wish, as we did, to ride face forwards, be

¹ *Story of the Earth and Man*, ch. 13.

careful to start in that direction, as the train reverses almost directly after starting, as well as again on quitting Boulogne. Many tourists are tempted to go, at Basle, to the celebrated inn of the three kings so charmingly situated on the bank of the Rhine. On a previous visit, however, we found its arrangements to be sadly unsanitary, and therefore preferred on this occasion to go to the Euler, close to the railway station, ready for an early start the following day. The noble old cathedral, though still devoted to Protestantism, has yet been cleansed and restored and made ready for better things. Meanwhile there is a fine new Catholic church, a solid, cruciform building, round-arched, with two handsome columns on either side dividing the nave from the aisles. It is rich with mural paintings and stained glass, but there is a singular absence of statuary. The next day was passed at the Bernerhof at Berne, rooms on the south side of which should always be secured, whence, weather permitting, a charming view of the snowy mountains of the Oberland is to be obtained.

The capital of Switzerland we found still presenting that painful evidence of the tyrannical injustice of European "liberals," the withholding from the Catholics of the church built by their own alms, and the handing of it over to that newest of all sects, the "Old" Catholics. We wish no evil to the members of that sect, though in just one respect we would have them less "free." We wish they would not make "free" with the property of other people. Of all the inconsistent forms of belief, it is difficult to imagine another so inconsistent as that of an "Old Catholic." In order to find a parallel to it, it would be necessary to meet with a "free-thinker" who based his freethinking exclusively on authority.

Our experience induces us to advise the traveller proceeding to Interlaken to do as we did; that is, after reaching Thun by rail, to hire a carriage to drive thence along the new road on the north side of the lake. It is a charming drive, by taking which the tedium of the steamboat with its many stoppages is avoided, and finer glimpses of scenery are obtained than any which can be had from the lake's surface.

We found Interlaken crowded for the termination of a shooting match, and were pleased to find the various provincial peasant costumes in much fuller use than we had ever hoped to see again.

The ancient convent church, at the east end of Interlaken, is in a sad condition. Its apsidal sanctuary is given up for Anglican worship, and part of the building, to the south, to the Presbyterians. The nave has been divided by a horizontal partition which forms both the roof of a cellar and the floor of an "upper chamber" which serves as the Catholic chapel. Here a priest sent from Basle said Mass daily at eight o'clock, and on Sunday Mass with a sermon

was at nine. The altar was ornamented in a sadly tasteless way with artificial flowers, plaster angels and a multitude of candlesticks. At the nine o'clock Mass on Sunday there was no singing, but a ceaseless "twiddling" on the harmonium, continually holding out hopes of a lapse into silence and continually disappointing them. The priest, however, gave an excellent sermon on the holiness of and the graces received by St. John the Baptist—it being the feast of his nativity. The church was not half full, and the priest informed us that during the "season" the Catholics are very remiss in their church attendance. We do not, of course, refer here to the sights of the vicinity, which were duly visited, but it may be useful for some readers to know that, by securing a return landau, the drive to Lucerne may be done for fifty francs. We left the Victoria Hotel at Interlaken at 8 A.M., and reached the door of the Sweizerhof at Lucerne at 5 P.M. Travellers should be careful not to hire a carriage which cannot be entirely closed, for the sudden and heavy showers of such mountain regions are not to be lightly regarded. This drive by Brienz and over the Brienz pass will soon be performed but rarely, as the railway has been completed since our visit. Those who go by it will lose much; for the aspects of nature far and near are most charming, while the handiworks of man beside the road are by no means devoid of interest. Nowhere do we know more characteristic "Swiss cottages" than those passed along the road between Interlaken and Brienz—namely, of Riggensberg, Niederried and Oberried. The mode in which the bees are kept seems a strange one. We saw a horizontal row of hives high up in front of the houses, as if they acted on a maxim that "every bed-room should have its own bee-hive."

It is a refreshing change to pass from Berne into the Catholic canton of Unterwalden, where, after lunching at Lungern, the travellers by carriage road should be sure to pull up at Sachseln to see its fine church, built in 1672, which contains the shrine and some relics of St. Nicholas of Flue—a local saint who lived at about the middle of the fifteenth century and whose painted image is to be seen on all sides in the cantons of Unterwalden and Lucerne. He was a countryman with a wife and large family. When his children were grown up and settled, he, with his wife's consent, retired to a hermitage where he passed the remainder of his life. St. Nicholas was born at Sachseln. The church contains twenty-two marble columns and several fine altars. The saint is represented in prayer on his marble shrine. Beside the church is a chapel containing the old tomb of the saint with a number of *ex votos*. At Sarnen, the capital of Unterwalden, there is a large church, a nunnery and a Capuchin friary. It is a clean and pleasant looking place, where every Catholic tourist should pause and thence

proceed to visit the charming and far-famed Engelberg with its venerable Benedictine monastery. From Sarnen the road for the most part skirts the lake to Lucerne which, with its quaint, well-known, wooden bridges, is a delight to the lover of art as well as to the lover of nature. The old collegiate church, with its twin western spires, has its Renaissance altars and bas-relief reredos profusely gilded, and its choir enclosed by an iron rood-screen with an altar in its midst. More interesting than the church, which was sadly dirty, is the cloister-bounded cemetery in which it stands—a sort of “Campo santo.” The graves and monuments were bright with flowers, and we noticed a wreath of roses freshly placed upon the monument of one who was born in 1799 and who died in 1839. A stone holy-water stoop, with its brush, was placed in every third interspace of the cloister pillars. The last Mass is at half-past nine, and we attended the ordinary week-day vespers with half-a-dozen strangers. The native congregation was represented by one pious lady with two small boys, but she did not seem to follow the service.

There were eight canons who came into the church singly through different doors ready veiled for the office. One came provided with an umbrella which he took with him to the choir. The day was threatening. Each wore a cotta with many vertical plaits, with a cloth tippet over the shoulders. The sacristan lighted six candles on the rood-screen and two on the altar. Then sixteen choir-boys entered processionally, each with a cotta reaching only to his waist, but with no cassock so that the dirty trousers of each boy were conspicuous beneath his short white vesture. Only every alternate verse of the hymn or magnificat was sung, a twiddling on the organ taking the place of the others, as also of various antiphones, versicles and responses. No incense was used at the “Magnificat.”

We next day visited the Capuchin Friary (near the well-known Lion monument, but higher up the hill), and were greatly struck with the order and perfect cleanliness of the little church—a great contrast to all those of the city below. A friar told us there were ten fathers and fourteen novices.

On the 25th of June we started for Andermatt, going by train to Erstfeld, where we had ordered a carriage to meet us, that we might continuously enjoy the scenery of the lovely valley of the Reuss, instead of burrowing through its flanks by the railway to Göschenen. We halted to enjoy a very simple, but very excellent, lunch at the Hotel des Alpes, Wassen. This is a charming spot, where anyone not objecting to somewhat rough living might stay and economize, as he would be taken in to board and lodge for thirty-five francs a week! At Göschenen we saw the northern mouth of the

long St. Gothard tunnel. Thence the ascent to our destination, Andermatt, was both continuous and steep, but we had, unfortunately, to mount it and cross the famed "Devil's Bridge" in rain and fog, and we gladly entered our snug quarters at the Belle Vue Hotel. Andermatt has some botanical interest. One finds a charming little yellow pansy in its fields, and a plant with a very large flower (*Saxifraga cotyledon*) on the banks near the Devil's Bridge (we were told by the director of the botanic gardens at Zurich) not found elsewhere in Switzerland; while a curious pine has a habit of growth which makes it look as if it has been blown almost to the ground.¹

The Belle Vue Hotel is large and commodious, but not cheap. The windows of our room commanded the valley as far as Hospenthal, the first village met with coming over the St. Gothard from Italy.

After a slight refecation we strolled out to see the rough and somewhat dismal-looking, though picturesque, village. We were struck with the attractive appearance of the small inn named "Les Trois Rois," charmingly situated on the right bank of the swiftly-rushing Reuss. Our first visit was, of course, to the church and clergy house, and we were directed to a small, white cottage, beside the door of which was a chain with a small cross as bell handle. We asked for the parish priest, and were shown upstairs, where, to our surprise, we saw three Capuchins at their evening meal of cake and cream. They were neither tonsured nor sandalled, and their dwelling was not reckoned as a true friary, but what they called a hospitium. Their monastic home is at Altdorf. They told us that the parish of Andermatt had been under the care of the Capuchins for two hundred years. The last Mass on Sundays and great festivals is at a quarter past eight, which Mass we attended the next day, that being the feast of SS. Peter and Paul. The church was a large and handsome structure, and very different in aspect from what would be found in most English villages of so small a size. All the richness and brightness of Andermatt seemed to be there, as was doubtless the case in an English village before the "Reformation." The long and spacious sanctuary was raised six feet; the altar, with a reredos of three superimposed pictures rising to the roof and successively diminishing in size, each being framed at the sides by three twisted columns of light blue, surrounded with spiral gilded wreaths. There were two other altars, one on each side of the chancel arch, and two more on either side of the nave. There was no rood-screen, but a rood, with SS. Mary and John, is suspended in the chancel arch, the figure of our Lord very ensanguined, with a

¹ Is this a condition produced by local circumstances which has become inherited?

"sacred heart" at the foot of the cross. The font stood at the side of the chancel arch. The nave was filled by carved wooden seats, clean and well-dusted.

At Mass the females were on the Gospel side. The first five benches were reserved for children, then came clergy on the male side, and some sisters on the other. Behind these were the laity. Although it was so great a feast, there was no deacon or sub-deacon, but only five serving lads, each in a scarlet cassock, cut up the middle behind and with a cape; cassock and cape being bordered with silver lace, and a red sash round the waist was tied in a large bow. The choir was represented by one male singer in the western organ-gallery, who only sang fragments of the "Gloria" and "Creed." Each "Amen" was singularly prolonged, lasting quite as long as the "*et cum spiritu tuo*." After saying the "*Oremus*" and the "Offertory," the candles were extinguished, and the priest left the sanctuary, coming down to sit with the others in the nave. Then followed a very long sermon divided into four portions, separated by a very long pause, during which an almost universal nose-blowing took place.

Mass being resumed, some ten or a dozen women in deep mourning rose just before the "Preface" and walked processionally up to a side altar, upon which each in turn deposited an offering. The "Benedictus" was not sung till after the "*Pax Domini*," etc., and the "Agnus Dei" immediately followed it. The "Ite missa est" was spun out almost to the length of a "Pater noster." The collection was made after the "Agnus Dei" by the master of the ceremonies, who wore a short cotta, but no cassock, which had a most absurd and undignified appearance while he was assisting the priest at the altar. There was a large and devout congregation, though there had been several earlier Masses. The men about us knelt the whole time except during the Gospel and the sermon.

At vespers all was sung in the organ loft, one priest in surplice and stole standing before the altar during the "Magnificat," and no incense was used. After the blessing, the priest went quickly to the sacristy, and, returning with brush and holy water, walked down the middle of the church sprinkling the people. The congregation again knelt the whole time after the psalms.

At the village of Hospenthal the church was smaller than that of Andermatt, but otherwise very similar to it.

The weather being much too severe to warrant our continuing our journey as we had intended (by Dissentis, Ilanz, and Thusis to Pontresina), we retreated north to Zurich. We took up our abode at the Hotel Baur au Lac, whence from our room on the third floor (there is a lift) we had occasionally a surprisingly fine view of the distant snowy mountains.

After a day's rest we started on a visit to the celebrated sanctuary of Einsiedeln. This vast Benedictine monastery, of very ancient foundation, was rebuilt in the last century. It consists of four huge quadrangles, in the midst of which is the large church. It is but twelve minutes' walk from the railway station on the further side of the little town, made up mainly of restaurants and shops of "*objets de piété*," to supply the mundane and pious requirements of the multitudes of pilgrims who annually visit the place. We made our way straight to the abbot's quarters, where (having sent in our letters of introduction) we were courteously received by Abbot Basilius, the fifty-first abbot of the house, whose brother is Vicar-Apostolic of Dakota in the United States. He confided us to the care of a father (who was the cellarius) to show us over the monastery and church. There were 87 Religious who were priests, of whom 40 were absent either in charge of parishes, giving missions, or doing other spiritual work. Of those in residence—which included a dozen lay brothers—the greater number were occupied about the abbey school, which contained 170 lads who were boarders and about 75 day-scholars. There were 32 lay brothers and 7 novices. The library was of moderate size, considering that it contained, we were told, 29,000 printed books with a few MSS.

The church is a curious, very ornate structure built round the small marble sacellum, wherein is enshrined the venerated image of the place, which is towards the western end of the nave, at the east end of which is a large sanctuary, high up and behind the high altar of which is the monk's choir. There is no clerestory, but a large gallery which runs round the church and which is entered from within the monastery. There is a low dome over the nave in front of the sanctuary. The ornaments are very rococco, with a profusion of painted and gilded stucco, sprawling figures on the roof in very high relief with legs hanging down, and cherubs which one fears may one day fall on the heads of worshippers.

There are two High Masses every day—a conventual Mass at 5.30 A.M. and one in the sacellum at 7.13, except on Sundays and feasts, when the second Mass is about 9 A.M.

We were told that only about from 10 to 15 fathers were free to attend choir. The monks have no sort of tonsure, but (unlike those of Austria) wore a hood and a cowl in church. They rise at 4.30, dine at 11. No monk has more than one room, and even the abbot has but two. We were not shown the refectory, and were told that it was against the rules of the Swiss Benedictine monasteries for any stranger to enter it. We were offered no sort of refreshment—a quite novel experience in our monastic

visits. This was, perhaps, on account of the multitude of restaurants in the town.

The abbeys and other religious houses of Switzerland must be regarded as survivals, since by the present constitution of the republic no new ones can be founded. Thus, even the Catholic cantons are not allowed to do as they like in this respect—surely, a most glaring example of the false conception of freedom which is entertained in Continental Europe. What would be thought in England or America if a dozen or two of men of independent means were not allowed to club together and live in common, wearing dressing gowns of the same pattern, and binding themselves to pass every afternoon in reading Shakespeare, to abstain from pumpkin pie every Tuesday, and never to drink any wine but Madeira, should it be their wish and pleasure to agree thus to bind themselves?

We attended Vespers, which were sung at 3 P.M. They would have been very nice but that the choir behind the high altar was so far away that the service could only be most imperfectly heard. Only four candles were lighted on the altar, no incense was used at the "Magnificat," and the organ played in the place of each repeated antiphon. After Vespers, 18 students and 22 monks came down, processionally, to the Sacellum, and there sang the "Salve."

Before quitting Zurich, we visited its Botanical Garden, which, although kept in a somewhat slovenly fashion, is interesting to the Swiss tourist, from its collection of Alpine plants.

Our next visit was to Constance, where we took up our abode in the old Dominican monastery, now the Insel Hotel, part of its ancient church now serving as the restaurant. Our windows commanded a lovely view over the lake of Constance, with the Vorarlberg in the distance. The morning after we arrived being Sunday, we started early to visit the churches, a hasty glance at which we had taken the evening before. We soon came upon a regiment on its way to St. Stephen's, and we followed them to assist at the military Mass. The soldiers nearly filled the church, and their services and recollected demeanor were most edifying. All that the benches would hold knelt. The rest stood. No helmets were worn, save by those on guard at each door, and, altogether, the contrast was great with what we recollect to have been the behavior of French soldiers at their "church parade." The services were long; a service and a High Mass, during which the soldiers sang in German. Instead of the bell, drums were beaten, and a roll of the drum preceded the reading of the Gospel. The service concluded with the three prayers: the first for the Pope, the second for the Emperor, and the third for the Grand Duke of Baden.

We next went to the Cathedral, being, we thought, in excellent

time to get places. But we found the edifice thronged to listen to a sermon, which seemed endless, and was followed by a long prayer in German; then other German prayers, said alternately by priest and people, and then a very prolonged announcement of services to come, and other church notices, so that this part was not over till more than a quarter of an hour after the time when the High Mass ought to have begun. A very civil beadle, with red gown, cap and staff, managed, with great difficulty, to find a place for the weakest of our party. The others had to stand the whole time with very many natives, for whom also there were no places. The congregation behaved reverently. The music was good and not florid. There was no deacon or sub-deacon, and the celebrant sang the Epistle as well as the Gospel. During the singing of the "Credo" the priest went on with the Offertory—a mode of celebration we never saw before.

The Cathedral is but of scant interest as an edifice, but the following points may be noted. The pillars of the nave are of the eleventh century, and monolithic, and their capitals extend beyond the narrow arches superimposed on them. The aisles are Gothic, their vaulting being supported in part by pilasters opposed to the columns of the nave. Each of the side chapels is inclosed within an iron screen, and at the west end is a very handsome Renaissance open gallery, and beside it a gigantic old fresco of St. Christopher. Beneath the sanctuary is a small crypt, and north of it is a chapel, with an *alto relievo* of the death of the Blessed Virgin Mary, painted, and also an elaborate Gothic winding-stair. The modern stained glass is very hideous, and over the chancel arch is a gigantic grand-ducal crown. The Augustinian church is given up to the "Old" Catholics, though there are exceedingly few of them. In the earlier morning of Sunday the shops remained shut, but towards midday they were nearly all open.

The almost incessant rain (which has raised the lake higher than it had been known to be for forty years) forbade our contemplated trip to the Abbey of Reichenau, wherein is the tomb of the Emperor Charles the Fat, whose deposition occasioned the rise of the existing powers of western Europe. A good band, in the hotel garden, helped to while away the tedium of our imprisonment, nor was the cookery to be despised, or the Meersburger-amlése wine. The rain continuing forced us to renounce the pleasure of steaming across the lake to Bregenz, and compelled us to go by rail, with the changes of train, one at Rorschach, and the other at St. Margarethen, at which latter place the nominal inspection of our baggage by courteous Austrian officials was gone through. The view of the Rhine Valley towards Feldkirche, as the line turns northwards towards Brienz, is very fine. On arriving, we went to the *Öesterreicher*

Hof, a good hotel, save that it is rather too near the railway for quiet comfort. We soon sally out to view the picturesque old town, and, happening to meet a Capuchin priest, ascend to see his convent and chapel. The latter was very clean, with a somewhat elaborate altar, which was served by a lay-brother. There were nine fathers, who wore neither tonsure nor sandals. The parish church, situated in the rear of the convent, is large and handsome, but very rococco. A deep ravine separates this part of the town from the rest. Bregenz is charmingly situated, and a country residence on one of the mountain slopes in the vicinity has, to our knowledge, been found very enjoyable and satisfactory.

The morning after our arrival, we drove out to visit the Abbey of Mehreran. It was a deserted Benedictine house, and has been occupied by Cistercians, who were expelled from Switzerland by energetic "liberals." These sons of St. Bernard consist of fifty priests, forty lay-brothers, besides novices, while a school with 126 boarders is attached to the abbey. The monks' refectory was very simple, and their cloister was provided with stalls all round it. The old Abbey church having been destroyed, they have built a new one which, though architecturally inferior (a large quasi-Gothic hall), is yet a fine thing in its way, for it is lined throughout with beautifully painted decorations, done by a lay-brother, who has shown himself to be an artist of no small skill, and one animated by the same sentiments as those which guided the pencil of Fra Angelico. A small cloister, leading from the church to the convent, was especially remarkable for its devotional paintings. How often religion seems to inspire this power!

The following day we proceeded to the Bavarian city of Lindau. This six miles' journey is almost always performed by rail, but we preferred a carriage-drive. On shortly reaching the Bavarian frontier, our Jehu vainly endeavored to arouse the custom-house official, who was evidently indulging in a post-prandial siesta. At last we saw a movement within, which was the functionary struggling with his uniform. The task accomplished, he appeared evidently much impressed by the unwonted sight of a travelling carriage, and, with a profound bow, asked if the "Herrschaften" had anything to declare. The Herrschaften replying they had not, with another profound bow, we resumed our pleasant drive, which, when we ceased to skirt the lake of Constance, took us through meadows full of wild flowers and blue with those of a tall orchid.

Lindau should be visited. It is an agreeable city, charmingly situated, and we found comfortable quarters at the Bayerischer Hof.

We had a charming view from our windows of Bregenz and all the country we had left, including the gorge of the Rhine Valley,

with its mountain boundaries, while busy steamers were going and coming from the quay in front of our hotel.

Lindau is a mainly Catholic city, and yet, under the Catholic government of this Catholic country, the Lindau Catholics fare but badly. A magnificent old church stands desecrated, and there are but two churches, which stand side by side. One, Catholic, and open all day; the other, Protestant, and closed. The Catholic children, by themselves, fill the Catholic church entirely, so that a cry of insufficient church accommodation is, indeed, justified.

Next day, we started for Munich, a journey which, as usual, we performed in a carriage to ourselves, and which would have been thoroughly enjoyable but for clouds and rain, which sadly marred our view of the Tyrolese Alps. To be conveniently placed in the heart of Munich, it is well to go to the Bayerischer Hof, but, certainly, for no other reason. After our journey, however, we gladly took up our abode there. Next morning, our first visit was to the adjacent Cathedral, the round-topped twin towers of which are visible for many a mile around. It was Thursday, and we found that on that day there is always a High Mass and Procession of the Holy Sacrament, which was proceeding as we entered. The congregation was large, and the music very grave and solemn. It was thirty years since we last visited this city, and we were delighted with the improvement effected in the venerable Cathedral by the late Archbishop, and it is, to our mind, decidedly the most devotional church in Munich, far more so than the Basilica of St. Boniface or any other of the much-vaunted modern structures. Its lofty aisles, as high as the nave, separated by image-bearing pillars which melt into the groined roof above without capitals, are very noble.

Our next experience was a singular commercial one. We carried a letter of credit for the principal European cities, addressed to Bloch & Co., and also to the Bayerischer Bank, in Munich. On presenting it at Messrs. Bloch's, the following colloquy ensued: "But I have had no advice of this from your bankers." "Of course not. Messrs. ——— cannot send special advices to all their correspondents in Europe about every letter they give their clients." "How am I to know you are the person named?" "There is my signature on the letter, and I will write another for you to see." "We must have more than that." "Here is my card-case with a lot of my cards in it." "That will hardly do." "Here is my foreign-office passport." "A passport might do, but this is not a new one." "No, but observe my name printed on its leather case. Here also is a letter of introduction just written by Cardinal Manning." "Pardon us, but all these things might have been picked up. Can you bring any resident in Munich who knows you?" "I can bring an official who has known me for thirty years." "Bring him with

you this afternoon, and we will honor your letter of credit." Amazed and disgusted we went to the Bayrischer Bank: "Will you give me fifty pounds on this letter of credit?" "Of course; how will you have it?" The moral of this contrast is obvious: "Go not to Bloch & Co!"

At Munich, as at various other cities, we met with the modern nuisance of "International Exhibitions," making a visit to its picture gallery obligatory. We were amazed to see some very curious portraits of Gladstone. There were also many of Döllinger, and one very terrible one of the late unfortunate King Ludwig II. Clad in royal robes and grasping his sword, his countenance was so wonderfully wild and savage that its image haunted one of us for days. The two pictures which charmed us most were an Italian interior, marvellously realistic, called "In the Kitchen," by Gaetano Chierici, and a Spanish picture by José Alcazar Tojedor, representing a first Mass. It is a custom on such occasions for the priest after he has finished to sit in a chair in the sanctuary, that the congregation may come to kneel and kiss the hands that have just offered up the Holy Sacrifice for the first time. This large picture represents the interior of a stately Spanish church; the priest seated, his back to the altar, with the various assistants on either side. His peasant parents have come to salute him, and his kneeling mother is taken into her son's arms, who is kissing her toilworn cheek, while the father stands, overcome by emotion, at her side.

We next renewed our acquaintance with the modern Benedictine Abbey of St. Boniface, and with our good friend Father Gregory Rossi, no less amiable and obliging now than when we first made his acquaintance, then in 1857. But the state of the abbey, we found, had become much more trying to its inmates, for their parish had enormously increased as to its population, whilst the number of religious had diminished. They were reduced to twelve priests and were greatly in want of novices. Their High Mass was exceedingly impressive with solemn music.

Each monk is allowed to furnish his cell in his own way, through money received from friends. The library contains 20,000 volumes. Matins are said at 6 A.M., and all the office is now recited in monotone; thirty years ago it was sung. The monks rise at 4 and go to bed at 9, and they abstain two days each week.

At the Cathedral we found that no office or capitular Mass was said or sung during the months of June, July, and August, which period is the canon's vacation. Of course, there were Vespers for the people on Sundays at 3. At St. Michael's (the old church of the Jesuits) the music is very ornate, with a full orchestra, and a great crowd assembles to hear it. At the students' church, Mass is said at 9, and none but students go in beyond the iron screen

near the west end. We saw no students either genuflect or kneel. At the Cathedral Vespers we found a priest and two cantors in shabby copes. The altar was incensed during the singing of the Antiphon and before the "Magnificat." The altar of the Blessed Sacrament was not incensed. There was a fair congregation. After the "Salve," the Blessed Sacrament was carried to the high altar and a blessing given with it. Then a priest ascended the pulpit and said the Rosary, which was followed by the Litany of the B. V. M. and various prayers. Then the Blessed Sacrament was again incensed, but neither the "Tantum Ergo" nor anything else was sung, but Benediction given at once, after which the Host was carried back to the altar behind the choir. After this came a sermon, at the beginning of which we left. We then paid a short visit to Salzburg, where we stayed,*at the conveniently situated Hotel d'Autriche, having previously found the more magnificent Hotel de l'Europe so inconveniently remote from the city. The sights of this city and the excursion to Königsee are so well known that we will only make one or two remarks. The drive to Berchtesgaden has been somewhat spoiled by the carrying of a steam tramway half-way there; it has great charms, nevertheless. Soon after passing the new cemetery we came upon an open wood full of orchids, campanulas, mulleins, and other beautiful wild flowers. The chapter house of the old Augustinian church, at Berchtesgaden, has a single row of columns running along its middle—like many an old refectory. Here, during the season, Protestant worship is carried on. The churches and cloisters are well worth a visit, though few tourists stop to see them. The weather continuing extremely unfavorable, we determined to leave and go direct to Augsburg, which ancient and venerable city we reached on the evening of Saturday, July 21st, taking up our abode at the historic house of the "Three Moors," although the old mediæval hostelry has been long since rebuilt. It is a magnificently spacious and solid building. The first church we visited, at half-past six on Sunday morning, was that of St. Ulrich—a large and graceful edifice, in the middle-pointed style. As it had for a considerable time been (as had all the other churches in Augsburg) a Protestant church, none of its pious imagery, with which it was replete, was older than the 17th (or very late 16th) century. The high altar, and also two altars right and left of the chancel arch, had each a reredos in extremely high relief and profusely gilt and painted. The effect is certainly rich and striking. A series of chapels (chantries, etc.), of different dates ran along the Epistle side of the nave, each being enclosed with its wrought-iron screen of corresponding date to the chapel it enclosed—a very interesting collection. In front of the Epistle side of the chancel-arch was a sunken chantry chapel of a bishop; a short flight of steps leading

down to it. The chapel itself was rococco, but it contained a fine early Renaissance monumental figure. On the Gospel side of the nave was another chantry with a marble figure of a warrior all enclosed in a metal-work screen. The lofty pillars of the church were devoid of capitals. There was a small altar in the nave, in front of the middle, enclosed only by Communion rails. Here the Blessed Sacrament was reserved, and to it people came up for Holy Communion.

We next visited the Cathedral, which has an ancient, low, early-pointed nave and a lofty eastern choir of the latest Gothic style. At the west end of the nave is another choir and altar of later date than the nave, but more ancient than the eastern choir. Besides a number of lateral chapels, there is an altar against almost every pillar of the nave. The Blessed Sacrament was reserved at a chapel on the Epistle side of the nave, and Benediction with the ciborium was given after Low Mass.

On coming out of the Cathedral we encountered a Benedictine monk. He told us that his house in Augsburg, which dates from 1806, contained twenty-five fathers. They have an orphanage with about seven hundred children. After returning to our hotel for breakfast, we went to hear High Mass at St. Ulrich's. On our way there we looked into the Protestant place of worship, which is formed of part of the building of St. Ulrich's. It was a quadrangular hall with a gallery all round, and was crowded with a sitting congregation all singing heartily together. The Communion table had its crucifix and two lighted candles, as usual in Lutheran places of worship.

At St. Ulrich's it was impossible to find a seat. High Mass was sung in the choir, while Low Mass proceeded at the small Communion altar in front of it, with the ciborium exposed. There was a full band, but no deacon, sub-deacon, or incense.

Strangers should drive, as we did, all about and around the city, which is picturesque and interesting, with its old gates and walls, and the curious "Fuggerei," a little walled-in town within the city, with several narrow streets and its own church.

In the Jacobstrasse we found a fair going on, with a multitude of people, amongst whom were many peasants, male and female, in picturesque costumes.

Our next halting-place was Ulm; well worth stopping at, not only on account of its Cathedral,—now used for Lutheran worship,—but on account of its picturesque streets of houses with high-pitched roofs and gables towards the street. The tower of the Cathedral we found was being rapidly surmounted by a tall spire, the erection of which (like that of Cologne Cathedral) was arrested by the anti-Christian movement misnamed the Reformation. Two new low towers, with spires, have been built beside

the sanctuary. The stalls are very elaborate. Those on the Gospel side are decorated with figures of the distinguished men of Heathendom, Jewry, and Christendom, from Pythagoras to Copernicus; the stalls on the Epistle side being similarly decorated with female figures. At the west end of one series of stalls is a figure of the carver of the stalls, and one of his wife on the west end of the other series. We stayed here at the Hotel de Russie, because it was so near the station. We found the living excellent and the beds exceptionally comfortable.

The next day we journeyed pleasantly to Stuttgart in a carriage by ourselves. The line is very pretty about Gippengen, where there is a sharp descent between rocky hills, a wide plain looking like a sea being visible at intervals in the distance.

At Stuttgart we went to the Hotel Marquardt, which is much to be commended. The city was, to us, formal and uninteresting, being almost entirely devoid of mediæval remains. Here we fell into a mistake which might also be made by other Catholic travellers. Close to the hotel is a plain, ugly church, with a simple cross above its front, which we were told was the "Old Catholic Church." It turned out to be not, as we had rashly supposed, the conventicle of the "Old Catholics," but simply the elder of the two Catholic churches now existing in the city. The more recently built one—the Marienkirche—is a handsome structure, with two imposing western towers and spires. It has no clere-story, lofty pillars supporting a groined roof of the same height throughout. Catholics have by no means full freedom in Stuttgart—no female religious daring to wear a habit. The only mediæval church we saw—the Stiftskirche—was in a very late, debased, Gothic style, and presented no objects which appeared to us interesting.

On leaving Stuttgart we went direct to Cologne, very comfortably in a carriage to ourselves. The road is generally but little interesting, except where the Vosges mountains appear in the distance across the great plain whereon stands Speyer. After leaving Darmstadt, the Taunus range comes into view. The Rome of the North, "Colonia," is a city too familiar to all travellers to permit many words to be here written about it. Yet it is such a mine of Christian architecture (to the study of which a lifetime might be well devoted) that we think a few notes on its older churches may be welcome. Probably the least interesting of all its mediæval churches is its far-famed Cathedral—majestic as it unquestionably is. Its interior effect is, however, ruined by its sad stained glass (of the Munich kind), without brilliancy. Of the many interesting churches in the German Gothic style, the traveller should not omit to visit that solemn one named St. Mary of the Capitol;

nor should any one of English race fail to make a pilgrimage to the remote little church of St. Mary, wherein he will find a shrine professing to contain the relics of St. Alban, protomartyr of England.

Amongst the features which mark many of the old churches of the city may be mentioned their very short apsidal chancels, crypts—eastern or western in position—with martyrs' tombs (evidently a fashion directly derived from Imperial Rome), and very extensive western porches, each like a transept at the west end. The Church of the Apostles (in the round-arch style) has its short choir and transepts, each with an apsidal termination. St. Columba's church is a debased Gothic building, singularly wide, with double aisles and galleries over the external ones, with a stone vaulting above as well as below each gallery. A remarkable peculiarity in this church is the construction of its southernmost aisle, which narrows gradually westward to accommodate the disposition of the street outside. This arrangement produces a singular effect in the vaulting in conjunction with that of the adjacent aisle, which is of the same breadth throughout. The Minorites' church, an early middle-pointed building, is remarkable for its massive columns, short in proportion to the arches they support, and the wall above which presents an extensive surface for fresco painting. In the elaborate Renaissance church, which formerly belonged to the Jesuits, the cassocks, rosary, and cross of Saints Francis Xavier, Ignatius, and Aloysius of Gonzaga were, and we believe are still, preserved. St. Gereon's church, one of the most interesting in Cologne, has a circular, or rather ten-sided, nave, surmounted by a dome, a choir with an apse extending from one side of the nave, much elevated and approached by a higher flight of steps, on either side of which is an entrance to the crypt. This interesting edifice suggests the idea that a magnificent church might be built from it as a model, with the addition of transepts and a nave; such a church, indeed, seems once to have enclosed within its area the pillar of St. Simon Stylites, in Syria. The small and very ancient little church of St. George has a singularly barbaric aspect from the unequal sizes and distances from each other of the pillars of its nave. St. Lambert's has an especial interest, from the fact that it was completed in the same year as that in which the Cathedral was begun, although the pointed arch makes but a scanty appearance here and there.

But our space is exhausted. Suffice it to say that on the weekday morning on which we left Cologne (July 25th) we found a High Mass proceeding in each church we visited. The city so long widowed of its bishop is again at peace. Long may piety and virtue flourish within its wide and rapidly increasing boundaries.

THE OBJECTIVITY OF HUMAN KNOWLEDGE.

MANY are the systems of philosophy which have, within recent years, appealed to the thoughtful consideration of men. In every case the appeal has awakened a willing response; and the examination conducted by competent judges, with uniform courtesy and admirable forbearance, terminates with the verdict that they all contain a surprisingly small amount of truth, buried in a surprisingly large amount of error.

The source of all these errors is, no doubt, a profound ignorance of man's nature, the absence of a just appreciation of his capabilities and of his wants, which must necessarily eventuate in establishing gross materialism or inane idealism. Had half the energies employed in speculation been directed to a simple observation of realities, the increment to the general fund of knowledge would offer a better qualitative, if not quantitative, representation of the labor expended. Man being formed by a substantial union of soul and body, all the operations attributable to him as a member of the human species must bear the stamp of his nature. In common justice to the intelligence and wisdom of his Creator, who not only proposes to Himself an end in all that He does, but aptly disposes the means to a certain attainment of that end, he must recognize the inter-dependence of body and soul, the admirable correspondence between the sensations of the one and the affections of the other as an essential provision in the economy of the Divine plan. The body is the handmaid of the soul in supplying through sensation the materials upon which the intellect is to act; it is the medium which preserves intact our relations with the external world, and supplies the thousand and one truths which are categorized and verified by the understanding. If we isolate the soul in its operations, we elevate man to the order of pure intelligences and pronounce the body superfluous. On the first point, what is the testimony of conscience, and in the second case, how vindicate the wisdom of the Creator?

The subjectivism of Kant, which would make us the victims of appearances, is fundamentally a denial of the true nature of man; and here we have an *a priori* reason for rejecting the legitimacy of its conclusions, to which additional strength is added by the irresistible impulses of our nature. Indeed, philosophers may cavil as much as they please about the reality contained in our ideas; but when they return to practical life, their actions are at variance

with their theories, nature asserts her dominion once more, they become men instead of enthusiasts, and comport themselves as do their more humble brethren. After all, who would not rather be wrong with nature, if it must be so, than right with the philosophers?

Again, the same fundamental principle which, in the subjective order, underlies the criterion of consciousness and gives validity to its testimony, impels the intellect to advance still farther and to say that our ideas are not mere empty forms of the mind, pure phenomena succeeding one another without any thread of connection, launched like some mysterious craft upon the vast sea of thought, indicating neither whence they came, whither they tend, or why they are there. Were it so, then might we conclude with Carlyle: "Not our logical measurative faculty, but our imaginative one, is king over us, I might say priest and prophet, to lead us heavenward, or magician and wizard to lead us hellward. The understanding is thy window—too clear thou canst not make it: but phantasy is thy eye, with its color-giving retina, healthy or diseased."

No; our ideas present themselves as symbols, symbolizing something, as well accredited messengers giving adequate expression to the truth which they contain.

It is a strange fact that skeptics, relying upon consciousness, recognize the force of the principle of contradiction in the subjective order, and still refuse to admit its validity in the objective order, although incited and eventually constrained thereto by the necessity of their nature. Facts require witnesses, not proofs. And if we find ourselves irresistibly forced to the admission that we really experience certain modifications in our soul, so, also, are we under the inevitable necessity of believing that what appears to us is really as it appears. If we cannot prove the former (and we cannot), neither can we prove the latter; in both cases there is equal necessity. Hence, to discriminate where discrimination is inadmissible is to manifest a pernicious predilection in favor of one's own conceits, an arbitrary exclusiveness which, seeking a reason for everything and giving none for anything, would undermine the foundations of science by rendering the operations of the mind impracticable, make man a mystery to himself, and sap the root of morality—for surely this is the philosophism which says: "There is nothing either good or bad, but thinking makes it so." (*Hamlet*, Act II. Sc. 2.)

We have thus far strongly insisted upon the invincible necessity of our nature to accept the light of objective evidence manifesting itself subjectively; but we do not intend to thrust this fact as a homeless and helpless charge upon your charitable consideration. At this particular point of philosophic inquiry, the resources of reason have expended themselves, for we are now dealing with primitive facts of our nature. Should reason attempt to

go further, it transports itself beyond its proper element, and only succeeds in showing its own imbecility. However, we do not ingloriously abandon the field to skeptics, but draw upon arguments which, though indirect, are not the less apposite or cogent.

Those who find such insurmountable difficulties in admitting the connection of the idea with its object, speak very securely of subjective certitude. "We are not sure," they say, "that our ideas are more than illusive phantoms relatively to the external world, because reason is unable to prove the existence of any necessary connection between the subjective and the objective orders; but as for internal phenomena, conscience will not allow us to doubt of their reality. We are sure that we think, that we feel, and that we are cognizant of what takes place within us. But, pray, upon what grounds? If you reject entirely the objective order, the principle of contradiction fails; and in that case you are not sure that you think, that you feel, since you can at the same time both experience and not experience the same subjective modifications. Either, then, you are sure that you feel and think, or you are not. If you are, then you assert the existence of something objective; if you are not, then universal skepticism has the day.

The inference which we naturally draw from this argument is, that the subjective supposes the objective order, and is so entirely dependent upon it that both must stand or fall together. It is impossible to advance one step towards the acquisition of truth without attaching an objective value to our ideas, without supposing an objective truth in some judgments. Or, in the words of St. Thomas: "There are some truths in which there can be no appearance of error—as in the case of the axioms; wherefore, our intellect must assent to them." (Lib. 2 Sent., dist. 25, q. 1., a. 2, c.)

But there are other still more important phases of the question to be considered. Subjective certitude supposes that we have the consciousness of our own identity at various times, as also that the mind enjoys the power of reflecting upon itself. But if our ideas be deprived of their objectiveness, then are we in doubt as to our individual personality.

Consciousness is of present acts. When, therefore, we affirm that we are the same persons now that we were yesterday, the truth of the judgment is manifestly dependent upon our knowledge that the relation existing between the idea of what we were yesterday and the reality is identical with that existing between the present idea and its reality. In other words, the state of our existence in the past is presented to us by the idea which enters into the present act of consciousness, between which idea and its object there is, therefore, a perfect correspondence.

If, then, this relation be denied, your identity dissolves before your very eyes; you know not at any one moment whether you

be the same person that you were the moment before ; you experience diverse acts taking place in your soul ; but for you they are meaningless, because disconnected and out of sympathy with the necessities of your being. In arriving at this conclusion, we have shown that the validity of our judgments is based upon the correspondence of the idea with its object. If this adequation be wanting by reason of the non-existence of the object, all judgments are impossible. Judgments enter into ratiocination in quality of essential constituents. Consequently, if judgments be impossible, reasoning is at an end. Moreover, the human mind, being the lowest in the order of intelligences, acquires its knowledge not by intuitive perception, but by many successive judgments and reasonings ; these being impracticable, thought itself must disappear from our midst. But not even the act of reflection, by which the mind makes itself the object of its own consideration, appears to be possible, for reflection is a second act which supposes a first or direct act bearing towards it the relation of object. Since, however, there is no such thing as objective truth, it follows that there can be no reflection. From what has been said, it is evident that in the event of such opinions obtaining general sway, the colossal edifice of science would find itself trembling to its very base ; for not only is the legitimacy of man's faculties as criterions of truth questioned thereby, but the object of all science, which is the *nature of things*, and not our ideas, is destroyed. These are some of the consequences which follow in the train of subjectivism, and which, independently of the dictates of our natural reason, would be sufficient to make us revolt against doctrines so absurd, not to say pernicious. To the abnormal desire of subjecting all truths, even the most evident, to the touchstone of reason and to the conviction that in such a capacity reason had failed, is traceable the frenzy which possessed Berkeley with the determination of doubting everything. The quintessence of the philosophy of pure reason is contained in the epigrammatic verse :

“ We are such stuff
As dreams are made of, and our little life
Is rounded with a sleep.”—(*Tempest*, Act IV. Sc. 1.)

But if we are appalled, and justly so, at the sight of the frightful destruction caused in the realm of intelligence by those who refuse to our ideas all objectiveness, what shall we say when we contemplate the results of their excursion into the sphere of morality, where the havoc is the more lamentable in that the interests involved are more important ? We have seen the sensible and intellectual orders fade before the withering sophistry which thrives in doubt, and now we are called upon to witness the dissolution of the moral world. There are two kinds of intellectual pronounce-

ments: the one speculative, the other practical; both are equally evident, universal and necessary. The former are the fundamental principles of all rational science, the latter of all action. The former express the synthesis of what is, the latter of what is to be done and come under the denomination of moral principles. If asked their nature, we answer that they are manifestations of the infinite wisdom of God, defining the essential, and therefore necessary relations of things among themselves, and indicating to us, through the feeble light of reason, the means which must, without fail, lead us to our appointed end. They are laws, then, instituted for our direction as moral beings, and emanating from God, the Creator of our souls. Here, again, as in the case of intellectual principles, our understanding spontaneously yields to the force of immediate evidence, and pronounces them objective and real, since they have their reason of existence in the Divine essence. But we are told that there is no such thing as the real order. Then, away with all laws and principles, since, at best, they are utterly useless. Why should we be obliged to sacrifice our liberty by subjecting our will to certain rules of conduct, when they express but a combination of meaningless ideas, which have no binding force in themselves and whose observance or violation is attended with neither advantage nor disadvantage? The law supposes the existence of good and evil, since it enjoins the one and prohibits the other—but for us, good and evil are mere figments. What though there exist laws which tell us when we do good or evil? what though the words good and evil find a place in the vocabulary of all nations, thus proving a universal belief in their real existence? what though conscience keeps constant watch over all our actions, approving or reproving us according as we fulfil or prove faithless to our obligations? For us, good and evil have only a phenomenal existence, and can, therefore, command no influence over our conduct. The law also supposes a legislator who has the authority to promulgate it. But, how are we to know that such a being exists? Whether we infer His existence from the idea of the infinite with Descartes, from the existence of the moral law with Kant, or from the idea of necessary and contingent beings, of mover and moved, of primary and secondary efficient causes, with the scholastics, we are never sure that our idea corresponds to the reality unless we concede to it an objective value.

But you may say, although the intellectual order be involved in uncertainty, it is far otherwise with the moral order. Speculative reason teaches us nothing objective, but practical reason imposes an obligation which is both real and objective. To proceed after this manner is to evade rather than to solve the difficulty. At all events, such admissions must be attributed to the secret impulses of nature triumphing over sophistry, and to the conviction on the

part of subjectivists that without the real order there can be nothing but inextricable confusion. However, the distinction made between speculative and practical reason is gratuitous, for it rests on no proof of reason or fact of experience. In any case, it serves no purpose but to show the dilemma in which its author has succeeded in placing himself; for, according to the system which he has constructed, all truths, whether they pertain to the speculative or practical order, are only forms of the mind, and hence destitute of corresponding objects in the real order. Having in the beginning absconded from facts of experience and taught that the operations of the mind are to be explained *a priori*, he can never bridge over the gulf separating the objective from the subjective order. This must be evident from the manner in which he attempts to explain the origin of morality. He makes the moral worth of an action depend upon its obligatory character. But what imposes the obligation? Practical reason. Therefore practical reason, which we have shown to be entirely subjective, is the efficient cause of morality, which must likewise be subjective; and if morality be objective, it represents nothing fixed or determinate, but is liable to constant mutation, and, varying with each individual, may prove self-contradictory. What must be the character of the thoughts, the aspirations, the sympathies and the affections of a human heart when such a lax code is proposed to man as an effective means of developing the total capacities of his moral nature? In the depths of his soul he experiences only chagrin and disappointment, for his yearnings are after a nobler ideal. But his reason offers him no other, because it is unable to measure the infinity which is bound up in a human spirit, causing it to expand until it has attained the fruition of its object.

We have now arrived at the end proposed to ourselves. In taking a survey of the ground traversed, we must be convinced that there is no fact of our nature more immediately evident or supported by stronger proofs than that of the objective character of human knowledge. We have seen that wherever nature commands superiority—as in the duties of practical life—we necessarily refer our ideas to the reality; and, moreover, that when a different course is pursued, we destroy all intellectual and moral principles, undermine the foundation of even the subjective order, involve everything in obscurity, and ensure the permanent triumph of doubt. If this picture be frightful to contemplate, it is that presented by subjective philosophy when exposed in its true light. Yet it serves a good purpose in showing how empty must be all the cavils of skepticism when confronted by nature, and discourages pride of intellect by teaching our reason that it, as all things else, has a limit beyond which it may not go.

Scientific Chronicle.

COBALT, NICKEL, AND THEIR NEW ASSOCIATE.

As the determination of the atomic weights of the elements is of the greatest importance for the validity of many modern theories of chemistry, skilful experimenters have devoted themselves to researches on this subject. These researches are of great intrinsic value and interest, and although accuracy in the above determinations does not always reward their labors, still new and important discoveries are often the result of their patient investigations. Such, indeed, is the case before us. Cobalt and nickel have long been known as elements, and many attempts were made to determine their atomic weights, but without concordant results. Clemens Winkler decomposed gold chloride solution with known amounts of cobalt and nickel, and weighing the precipitated gold, obtained the equivalents of these elements in terms of gold. But as the atomic weight of this latter metal was not accurately known, the weights of nickel and cobalt thus deduced were not precise. Lately, however, Gerhard Krüss re-determined the atomic weight of gold with great accuracy, and resolved to repeat the method employed by Winkler. With the assistance of F. W. Schmidt, numerous experiments were made, which gave varying results. They obtained neither the figures previously given by Winkler nor those given by C. Zimmermann. The variations were too great to be accounted for by ordinary analytical errors, and hence the disturbing cause had to be looked for elsewhere. In washing gold that had been reprecipitated by sulphurous acid, the filtrate had a red color due to cobalt chloride. This color, however, disappeared after a time, and the wash-water became tinged with a slight greenish hue. On evaporation this green solution left a residue from which a chloride was obtained that differed from the chlorides of all the known elements. The same result was reached when nickel was employed instead of cobalt. This pointed out at once the disturbing cause in all previous investigations, and brought to light the existence of a previously unknown element. By careful manipulation, one gram of the oxide of the new metal was obtained from fifty grams of nickel oxide, and by drying the new chloride in an atmosphere of carbon dioxide and reducing it at a red heat, by means of hydrogen, the new metal was isolated. It is black, but when obtained in the shape of thin metallic scales has a brownish-black appearance. Electrolysis of the chloride also yields the metal. Thus, cobalt and nickel have all along been associated with this new metal, but the latter has been present in such small quantities as, heretofore, to escape detection. Cobalt and nickel are almost always found together in nature. Although the former

is mentioned by Basil Valentine, Paracelsus, and Agricola, still cobalt, as we know it, seems to have been discovered in 1742, by Brandt, and all previous use of the name was to indicate ores that did not contain this metal. Nickel was first mentioned by Hiarni, in 1694, but it was not until 1754 that it was definitely pointed out by Cronstedt. This latter metal has a silver-white lustre and is capable of receiving a very high polish. Moreover, it oxidizes only with great difficulty, and is, therefore, extensively used in the electro-plating industry. The bright appearance of our locks, keys, surgical instruments, etc., is due to a thin coat of this metal deposited on the iron by the aid of electricity. This electro-nickel-plating industry is carried on most extensively in this country. The discoverers of the new element are working on the atomic weights of cobalt, nickel, and the new metal, and we may expect to hear more about the latter in a short time.

ELECTRICAL RAILROADS.

THE application of electricity as a motive power is not new, but the rapid growth of this branch of electrical industry during the past year, especially in this country, cannot fail to attract attention. As the arc light is rapidly supplanting the feeble gas-lamp for illuminating our streets, and the glow-lamp the noxious gas flame in our private dwellings, so too the cheaper, more compact, and cleaner electric motor is superseding the steam-engine in our shops and manufactories. The more costly method of horse-traction, in use on our street railways, is being abandoned and some one of the systems of electric-traction is substituted in its place. This change has shown the evident superiority of the latter mode of traction, and brings up the question whether we cannot in the near future replace the steam locomotive by the electric motor. That electricity can economically replace horses, is shown by a glance at its rapid spread during the past year, while its universal adoption will depend on whether considerations of safety and æsthetics will allow the current to be economically conveyed to the cars. A glance at the following table will show the progress of the electric power industry during the six months from August, 1888, to February, 1889 :

	August, 1888.	February, 1889.
Electric street railways in operation,	34	53
Electric street railways building,	83	44
Electric street railways incorporated, but not yet contracted for,	39	42
Electric cars in operation,	223	378
Electric cars under contract; roads not yet finished, .	244	329
Miles of single track in operation,	138	294.5
Miles of single track under contract, not yet in operation,	189.5	273.75

The different systems of electric propulsion in use may conveniently be divided into two classes. In the first, the electricity is generated at a central station and conveyed thence by conductors, from which it is supplied all along the road to the motors attached to the cars. In the second, the car carries its own electric generator with it. The former class may be sub-divided into four, according to the methods adopted to convey the current from the central station to the various motors. They are, first, the overhead system; second, the third-rail system; third, the method which employs the two rails as conductors; and fourth, the underground conduit system. In the overhead system employed by the Sprague Co., the electricity is carried along a silicon-bronze wire $\frac{3}{16}$ ths of an inch in diameter. This wire is suspended 18 feet above the centre of the track by means of span wires that cross the street at every 125 feet. The span wires are supported by poles of very neat design. The return circuit is through the rails and the ground. A trolley, balanced from the roof of the car, runs along the silicon-bronze wire and conveys the current to the wires, which connect with the motor placed under the car, and in contact with the axle of the wheels. A similar system is employed by the Thomson-Houston Co. It has proved and continues to prove satisfactory. There is no danger to persons crossing the track as the wire carrying the current is out of reach, and hence all possibility of accidentally completing the circuit is precluded, except when the wire breaks and falls to the ground. But superior workmanship in the construction of these overhead wires removes uneasiness in this respect, for severe storms that during the past winter visited localities in which this system was in operation left the wires intact, when electric light, telegraph, and telephone lines were seriously disabled. In all these instances, too, the electric cars showed their efficiency by running on schedule time, when, in many cases, other methods of conveyance were suspended. The only serious objection to the adoption of this system in our large cities is the erection of poles in the streets and the running of overhead wires. In many cases, however, these poles are useful and ornamental, as in the case of the Washington road built by the Thomson-Houston Co. It is true the street is wide, and the poles, neatly furnished with cross pieces to support the trolley wire, are placed in the middle of the road. They carry the electric lamps, and thus remove the need of other lamp-posts. In the suburbs of our large cities, and in the smaller towns and cities, the above objection is not made, and here this method is chiefly used. The saving effected by its introduction may be gathered from some figures published in regard to the Richmond road, erected by the Sprague Co. The average cost for motive power per day for a horse car, that is, for from ten to eleven hours and trips of from 45 to 50 miles, was about \$4. This took into account only the horses on actual duty. With the electric system the cost per car for equal mileage is less than \$2, and the cost per car decreases with an increase in the number of cars.

The systems of employing either a third rail to carry the current or of

converting the two rails into conductors are objectionable on account of the continual danger to which citizens are exposed of receiving shocks when crossing the tracks. Moreover, there is a great loss of electricity due to leakage on account of the difficulty of maintaining proper insulation, and hence the current does a smaller amount of work in the motor. This last difficulty seems to have been overcome by an ingenious device in the Haus system, which has been shown lately in New York in a working model. Here one side of the track is made of 12 ft. rails. The current is carried by an insulated wire buried in the stringers under these rails, and each 12 ft. rail is in metallic contact with this wire. The circuit is completed by the car, so only that portion of the track on which the car rests is energized. Thus the great loss of electricity occasioned by using the insulated rails is prevented.

The fourth method of conveying the current from the central station is the Bentley-Knight system. A conduit is laid midway between the rails, and is firmly bolted to the stringers and sleepers. A cross-section of the conduit would be about one foot square. Copper bars an inch and a quarter thick, placed in this conduit, carry the current. In the upperside of the conduit there is a longitudinal slot $\frac{5}{8}$ ths of an inch wide. Thin iron plates about ten inches square, called "ploughs," hanging from the car, project into this slot and complete the circuit between the conducting bars in the conduit and the motor on the car. The first cost in this system is greater than in those already mentioned, while difficulties arise from want of proper drainage in the conduit and from insufficient insulation. Its introduction, however, shows that these difficulties are not insurmountable, and that the system is a practical one. It is adopted on Fulton Street, New York, and as a supplement to the Sprague overhead system, where the West End road runs through the crowded thoroughfares of Boston.

But in the second great method of electric locomotion, namely, in that in which the car carries its own electric generator, we seem to have found the ideal system. Here there is no danger from falling wires, as no overhead wires are employed, no danger to passengers crossing the track, since the rails do not carry an electric current, and hence no loss of electricity on account of insufficient insulation. If the electro-generator here employed were perfect, there would be no objection to the universal adoption of the storage battery system. Though of late many improvements have been made in these batteries, still much remains to be done. The Julien Electric Traction Co. is running surface cars on Fourth Avenue, New York, by means of storage batteries, and the results are very satisfactory. The batteries give back 80 per cent. of the watts received. A single car carries 120 cells of battery, each weighing 27 lbs., which with the weight of the trays and boxes add 3600 lbs. to the weight of the car. The load of an ordinary horse-car is three tons, so that one of these cars supplied with battery and motor weighs about $4\frac{3}{4}$ tons. This increase of weight helps the adhesion of the car to the rails, a necessary condition for its propulsion. The old cars can be re-

modelled for about \$250, which shows that the rolling stock of the surface roads can be used at a small cost for alteration. The change that must be made is the raising of the body of the car five inches above its present position to admit of placing the cells under the seats. These batteries have a capacity of 52 horse-power hours, and will run without recharging for 36 miles. The charging of the cells is effected by connecting them with a dynamo at the central station, and allowing the current to pass through them. The solution in the battery is decomposed by the current. When this decomposition is complete the battery is charged. On joining the terminals of the battery with the motor in the car, the separated elements recombine and give back a large percentage of the current spent in separating them. So the whole principle is a change of the kinetic energy of the dynamo current into the potential energy of the disassociated elements in the cells, and the reconversion of this potential energy into the kinetic energy of the electric current, which becomes mechanical energy in the motor. One great difficulty with this battery, in the beginning, was due to the warping of the plates, and a consequent short circuiting. This difficulty is overcome in the new types now in use, and in New York, since September last, there has been no record of short circuiting. If, however, this accident should happen, or should the battery die, the old material can be worked over at a moderate cost. Even should the battery live but six months, it is found to compete favorably with horse-traction.

The success attending the application of electricity in these different ways on our street railroads has led many to speculate on its supplanting our steam locomotives. The work of the Daft motor, Ben Franklin, on the Ninth Avenue elevated road, New York, is very encouraging. This is the largest railway electric motor yet constructed, and it has proved itself capable of doing the work required on these roads. The Ben Franklin weighs ten tons, or is only half as heavy as the steam locomotives in use on the elevated roads. Its total capacity is supposed to be about 150 horse-power. It was built to carry four loaded cars, 75 tons, over any grade of the road. This it has done, exceeding the schedule time by almost three miles per hour. On several occasions it carried eight empty cars, 122 tons, up the heaviest grades at the rate of $7\frac{1}{2}$ miles per hour. Competition is in favor of the electric motor. In the present system there are as many power generators as there are locomotives in use. In the electric system all the power will be taken from one source, a large stationary engine suitably placed somewhere along the line. This means economy. For considering the average locomotive engine, we find a consumption of nine pounds of coal per hour to the horse-power, while a stationary engine yields a horse-power for less than two pounds of coal per hour. This means that the cost of motive power would be reduced more than one-half by the introduction of electric motors. Wear and tear on the road is also diminished, since the weight of the motor is less, while the necessary adhesion is secured by the attraction that exists between the wheels and the rails that carry the

current. A steam locomotive must be always ready to exert its full power, and hence the entire power kept up is the maximum power of each multiplied by the number of engines; but in the electric system, the greatest capacity of the generating station is equal to the average work of one motor multiplied by the number of motors. This depends on an interesting and wonderful principle of self-adjustment possessed by an electric motor.

Dynamos and motors are interchangeable. When we use mechanical power on the machine and generate electric power, we call it a dynamo-electric machine. If we reverse the process and generate mechanical power by putting a current of electricity into the machine, it becomes a motor. While the armature of every motor is revolving and doing mechanical work, the motor retains, to some degree, its character of a dynamo machine. Hence, it is generating a current in opposition to the one that causes it to run. Thus the speed of the motor is regulated from within. If the motor tends to run too rapidly the opposing current is increased and thus the driving current is diminished, if, on the contrary, the motor tends to slow up, the opposing current becomes weak, and the driving current is increased. Considering, then, two electric trains on the same track, the one descending and the other ascending a grade, it is easy to see that the freely revolving motor of the descending train generates a counter-current that lessens the amount of the main current that enters it, and hence leaves the main current stronger to assist the ascending train. Therefore, the average work of one motor multiplied by the number of motors represents the power of the central station, and does away with the present waste of power necessitated by the use of separate locomotive generators. Reduction of attendance is also an item that tends to make the electric motor so much more economical than steam-engines. Cleanliness and absence of noise recommend this system to the public; and from the energy now displayed in this field, and the happy results already obtained, we may look forward to a complete change in our old methods of locomotion.

ALUMINIUM AND THE HEROULT PROCESS.

ALUMINIUM is the third most abundant element in the universe. It is an essential constituent of more than 200 different minerals. Almost all the gem minerals, except diamond, contain it. It occurs in sapphire, ruby, topaz, alexandrite, emerald, garnet, lapis-lazuli, turquoise, tourmaline, and a host of others. Thus far, however, the compounds worked for the metal are corundum, which is found in great abundance in the western part of North Carolina; cryolite, a double fluoride of aluminium and sodium, which is brought in great quantities to Philadelphia from Arksut Fiord, in Greenland; beauxite, hydrated oxide of aluminium and iron, which occurs in the southern part of France; and common clay, a silicate of aluminium, which is found almost everywhere.

The fine bluish-white color of the metal, its great elasticity and tenacity, its hardness and lightness, combine to make it valuable, and will open for it an extensive market as soon as it be extracted cheaply from its ores. Taking the average price of aluminium at the present time as twelve dollars a pound, the metal contained in a cubic yard of common clay would be worth over eleven thousand dollars. Should aluminium be put in the market at five dollars a pound, as is promised by the Birmingham Co., England, where the Castner process is employed, the value of the metal contained in a cubic yard of clay would still be over four thousand six hundred dollars. The abundance of such a valuable metal has stimulated inventors to work at methods of extracting it, so as to make it a commercial article. Descriptions have been given in past numbers of the CHRONICLE of the Cowles and Castner processes; we will but briefly allude to the new method of M. Heroult. It is in operation at the Swiss Metallurgical Works, Neuhausen, near the Rhine Falls. The process is an electrical one, but differs from the Cowles. In the latter, the electric current is used to produce an exceedingly high temperature, and the reduction of the ore is due to the heat, and therefore any current, whether direct or alternating, may be employed. In the Heroult process, on the other hand, the reduction of the ore is due partly to the heat and partly to the electrolytic action of the current; and hence, only a direct current can be used. The furnace in which the ore is reduced is made of carbon slabs held together by a wrought-iron casing. Through the cover of this furnace a bundle of carbon slabs passes to the interior. The ore is fed in through an opening in the cover which can be closed by a shutter. One of the electric wires is connected with the casing of the furnace and the other with the bunch of carbon slabs that passes through the cover. The current then passes from the carbon slabs through the ore to the molten ore which settles in the bottom of the furnace, and then out through the crucible and the other wire. The molten ore is decomposed, oxygen travelling upward and attacking the carbon, while the reduced metal travels downward and collects in the bottom of the crucible to be drawn off through a tap-hole and cast into ingots. So in this process the molten mass of oxide takes the place of the electrolyte in an ordinary voltaic couple. The ore employed is alumina free from all impurities. The furnace now in operation yields four hundred weight of aluminium in 24 hours. Alloys can also be made by introducing scrap metal into the furnace. When silicon-bronze is desired, scrap copper mixed with clean white sand is introduced into the furnace with the alumina.

BELLITE.

Engineering for February 8th contains a description of a series of experiments made at Chadwell Heath, England, with the new explosive, bellite. This explosive is the invention of Mr. Carl Lamb, and its

properties had already been shown by the Middlesbrough experiments. The experiments were arranged to bring out its characteristic properties and its adaptability to special purposes. One and a half pounds enclosed in a tin box and fired under water by means of a detonator sent the spray one hundred and fifty feet up into the air, thus showing its efficiency in submarine mining. Bellite can be handled with perfect safety and carried any distance without special precautions, as it can be fired only by a detonator. This was shown by breaking a bellite cartridge weighing four ounces in two, and throwing one-half into a fire, where it slowly burnt away. The other half was then exploded on a metal plate 12 inches square and $\frac{3}{8}$ ths of an inch thick. The shock bulged the plate to a depth of about two inches, but did not pierce it. To further convince the examiners of its perfect safety, one of the exhibitors held a portion of a naked bellite cartridge in one hand and applied a lighted fuse to it with the other. As long as the light was applied, it charred and smouldered, but was immediately extinguished on removing the fuse. Another experiment that further established its safety as well as its fitness for use in shells was made. A fragment of explosive was fired from a large-calibre gun against an iron plate without any explosion of the bellite occurring either in the gun or on striking the target. A good idea of its effectiveness was obtained on exploding a mine containing 8 pounds of bellite. The mine was fired under a length of railway laid for this purpose. The explosion broke both rails clean through. Several of the sleepers were splintered, while a large piece of one was thrown a distance of forty yards, and a hole formed in the ground about 12 feet in diameter. On a previous occasion a weight of half a ton was allowed to fall from a height of twenty feet upon some bellite cartridges, grinding them to powder but producing no explosion. The English government was deliberating on spending a large sum of money to acquire the secret of melinite, but will in all probability secure this explosive, which is so safely handled and so effective when discharged by a detonator.

Book Notices.

NARRATIVE AND CRITICAL HISTORY OF AMERICA. Edited by *Justin Winsor*, Librarian of Harvard University, Corresponding Secretary of Massachusetts Historical Society. Volumes V., VI., VII. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

The volumes now before us, together with II., III. and IV., which we noticed in a previous number of the REVIEW, make up the whole work, according to the plan described in its prospectus, excepting the eighth volume, which is still to be published, and the first, which, dealing as it will with the antiquarian history of America, will be the last of the series to be published, in order that advantage may be taken of the farther advancement of American archæological investigations which are now in progress.

In our previous notice we criticised the fundamental idea of the plan of the work, viz., that by associating together a number of writers, each laboring in a distinct field, they would correct each other's partisan, theological, or individual bias, and that this, along with careful revision by the editors, the critical analysis and essay appended to the work of each narrator, would secure to the whole work freedom from the individual dogmatism which detracts from the accuracy and reliability of historical works composed by one person. From the dissenting opinion we then expressed respecting this idea, we find no reason to depart on examining the volumes before us.

But, apart from this, these volumes are full of valuable information, carefully and laboriously collected and arranged, which it would be almost impossible for any one individual to gather respecting the history, social, political, intellectual, industrial and commercial condition and progress of the United States and of Canada, and their relations to the Indian tribes and to European nations during the whole of the last and the first half of the present century. It is thus a historical library in compact form, which, for number and variety of topics treated, is unequaled, or even approximated, by any publication on the general subject of American history, either on our own continent or that of Europe. And though this constitutes its greatest value to the general reader, yet to the scholar and the patient, conscientious investigator of the original sources of history it is its least. To him it will have a value far beyond this. To him it will be of inestimable value as a clue and a guide in directing him to long-forgotten or long-buried and recently-exhumed, but still almost unknown, documents, letters, narratives and other historical monuments or sources of information. To those, too, who delight in having reproduced before their eyes features of renowned explorers, adventurers, leaders, soldiers, statesmen, writers, speakers, or to ponder over the fac-similes of ancient documents, autographs, maps, plans and pictures of ancient buildings, cities, monuments, etc., the work will be a constant subject of pleasant study and enjoyment.

With these general remarks, we pass on to sketch the scope of the volumes before us.

Volume V. consists of eight narrative chapters, each followed by a

critical essay and numerous editorial notes upon the sources of information, etc. The first chapter treats of Canada and Louisiana from the close of the seventeenth century down to 1763. The second chapter has for its subject New England, from 1689 to 1763. The third chapter treats of the "Middle Colonies" during the same period. The fourth, of Maryland and Virginia. The fifth, the Carolinas. The sixth, the English colonization of Georgia. The seventh, the wars on the seaboard; Acadia and Cape Breton. The eighth, the struggle for the great valleys of North America.

Volume VI. is occupied with the history of the revolting colonies from the close of the French and Indian war in 1763 to the Treaty of Peace with England in 1783. It consists of nine chapters, each followed by a critical essay and copious editorial notes. These chapters are respectively entitled: The Revolution Impending; The Conflict Precipitated; The Sentiment of Independence, its Growth and Consummation; The Struggle for the Hudson; The Struggle for the Delaware; The War in the Southern Department; The Naval History of the American Revolution; The Indians and the Border Warfare of the Revolution; The West from the Treaty of Peace with France in 1763 to the Treaty of Peace with England in 1783.

Volume VII. consists of eight chapters, each followed, as in the previous volumes, with a critical essay and editorial notes. The respective titles of these chapters are: The United States of America, 1775-1782; Their Political Struggles and Relations with Europe; The Peace Negotiations of 1782-1783; The Confederation, 1781-1783; The Constitution of the United States and its History; The History of Political Parties; The Wars of the United States; The Diplomacy of the United States.

Following these chapters are two appendices respectively treating on the Territorial Acquisitions and Divisions; and on The Portraits of Washington.

When we come to examine more closely into the manner of treatment of the different subjects discussed, we find very many points which are open to unfavorable, but just, criticism. They are so numerous that even to mention them all would extend this notice beyond reasonable limits. There is one feature, however, which unfortunately characterizes the whole work. It is the undue importance and prominence which have been given to New England, or rather to Puritan ideas and movements, as though they were the chief formative factors of our political institutions and the principles which they embody. The truth is that the leading ideas of Puritanism and Separatism are opposed to the principles of equal political rights and of religious freedom. The examples of the Baptists of Rhode Island, of the Friends of Pennsylvania, and of the Catholics of Maryland were the most potent factors in disseminating and developing these principles in the Thirteen Colonies. And if the people of New England came in the course of time to adopt the same principles, it was not because of their religious tenets, but despite them. The ideal government of the New England Puritans was that of a religious oligarchy, the state and the Puritan churches were virtually identical, and all political power was exclusively in, and wielded entirely by, the members of the churches. That these ideas were gradually broken down in New England despite the persistent opposition of the ministers and members of the Puritan churches, was owing to the growth of industrial and commercial activity, which compelled the Puritans reluctantly to extend political rights to those who were not members of their churches. The whole history of Puritanism in New England conclusively proves this.

The subject of the relation of the New England colonies and of that of New York to the colonists of Canada and the Indians is treated in a very narrow and partial way. The French inhabitants of Canada and the Indian tribes that were controlled by them are represented as the aggressors in the almost continual conflicts between them and the colonists of New England and New York, and the Catholic missionaries who labored with heroic self-denial and disregard of indescribable hardships, tortures and death to Christianize the Indians are represented as secret political agents of the French governors of Canada, and as conspirators against the peaceful growth of the New England colonies and of New York.

Yet, just the opposite of this is true. The strife, so far as the French Canadians were concerned, was for existence and for the right to control, trade in, and colonize the regions which their own explorers had discovered and partly taken possession of. The impelling motive of the New England and New York colonists was that of commercial jealousy and rivalry, and of national and of religious hatred. How preposterous the notion is that the French were the aggressors and needlessly provoked hostilities, either with the Indians or the English colonies, is shown by statements of the condition of Canada at the close of the 17th century, contained in the narrative history of Canada and Louisiana in the 5th volume of the work before us. Referring to the death of Frontenac in 1698 and what he accomplished, the writer says: "A French population of less than 12,000 had been called to defend a frontier of hundreds of miles against the attacks of a jealous and warlike confederacy of Indians, who, in addition to their own sagacious views of maintaining these wars, were inspired thereto by [England] the great rival of France behind them." At that very time, too, when Canada had a European population of barely 12,000, Massachusetts alone had a European population of at least from 60,000 to 80,000. In 1714, according to the writer, "the total population of Canada was not far from 18,000," while "the English colonies counted over 400,000 inhabitants." The disproportion, too, as regards wealth, commercial prosperity, and military resources was still greater. Yet this same writer talks of "the cruel policy" of the French Canadian government "in maintaining an alliance" with the feeble Abnakis, who were partly Christianized and desired nothing of the New England colonists but to possess their own lands in peace. Equally preposterous is the statement that the Canadian government endeavored to "secure quiet in Canada by encouraging raids upon the defenceless towns of New England." The Indian raids upon the New England towns were caused by the cruel treatment of the Indians by the New England Puritans. The incursions from Canada into Northern New York were efforts of the Canadians and their partly Christianized Huron allies to free themselves from the incessant brutal invasions of the savage Iroquois, incited and assisted by the colonists of New York. The French desired peace, and constantly endeavored to establish peaceful relations with the Iroquois and all the other Indian tribes. The English colonists encouraged the Indians to reject the French proposals and to continue their savage warfare.

The same spirit of hostility to Canada, based not only on grounds of commercial rivalry and national jealousy, but also on those of intense religious hatred and bigotry on the part of the English colonies, especially those of New England and New York, continued down to the commencement of the War for Independence. And it was this, especially the element of religious hatred which entered into it, that caused the people of

Canada to reject the request made of them by the American colonies to take up arms with them against Great Britain. Had it not been for this the present Dominion of Canada, with all its vast undeveloped regions, almost equal in aggregate to those of the United States, would have been component parts of the American Union.

To the same narrow and un-Christian method of dealing with the Indian tribes is to be attributed the fact that during the War for Independence the Indians, instead of aiding the colonists, took sides with Great Britain, and not only during that war, but for many years afterwards harassed and raided the frontier settlements of the several States. They simply practised upon us the lesson which we had heinously taught and encouraged them to practise upon the Canadians.

But these unquestionable facts are kept in the background throughout the volumes before us.

A like narrow and partial manner of treatment is traceable in the references to Catholics and the part they took in the War for Independence. They were very few in number compared with the whole population of the Thirteen Colonies. They were objects of hatred and suspicion, and were subjected to grievous political and other disabilities. Yet they were conspicuous for the staunch and unwavering support they gave to the cause of the colonies, and their services were of inestimable value. But the references to these facts by the writers of the work before us are few in number and of the most meagre and indefinite character.

The chapter on the Constitution of the United States, and the different views that were entertained as to the subjects and powers it should include, and on the history of its adoption by the several States of the Union, is especially interesting at this time, when we are on the eve of celebrating the centenary of the inauguration of the first President of the United States, on which event our Federal Constitution may be regarded as having first gone into practical operation. Of like especial interest are other chapters, such as those on the History of Political Parties, the Diplomacy of the United States, and on other kindred subjects.

MANUALS OF CATHOLIC PHILOSOPHY (Stonyhurst Series): 1. *Logic*. By Rev. Richard F. Clarke, S. J. 2. *The First Principles of Knowledge*. By Rev. John Rickaby, S. J. New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1889.

These are two of a series of six manuals in which the Jesuit Fathers of Stonyhurst College, England, have undertaken to give to modern students an adaptation of Scholastic Philosophy. Hitherto we have had only Latin text-books of more or less lucidity—or want of it—and translations of some of these, made for the most part by Protestants and for use in Protestant institutions. In general, Catholics, therefore, have been without books available for ordinary lay readers, except such as, being written by non-Catholics and too often in a spirit of hostility to our religion, are unsafe for all but adepts in the science. And as even in such of these translations as are available there is too close an adherence to the original in phraseology as well as in matter, they have become antiquated and unsuitable, in view of the developments in our time, not so much of the science of logic itself, but of the branches of learning that are most cognate to it. To overcome this difficulty has been one of the chief objects of the authors and editors of these *Manuals of Catholic Philosophy*; and the end in view has been admirably attained, for not only is the treatment thorough, or at least as much so as the compass of each volume would permit, and the language as near that of everyday life as the nature of the subject would allow, but application is made of the whole subject and of each part of it to the needs of the day. This is

not only Catholic philosophy in the abstract, but applied Catholic philosophy as well.

Though the first in the order of study, the text-book of "Logic" has not been the first to appear in the order of time. After mastering its contents the student should take up the "Text-Book of First Principles." After these two are to come treatises on "Ethics," "Natural Theology," "Psychology," and lastly "General Metaphysics." With these manuals available no one need hereafter complain of lack of weapons with which to oppose the false principles of Hamilton, Mansel, Mill, the Kantists and the Hegelians. The sound principles of Aristotle and St. Thomas are now placed at the disposal of every reader, and it will be the student's own fault if hereafter he fails to find his way "into the safe paths of ancient wisdom, to point out where it is that the speculations of modern philosophizers have quitted the well-trodden high road of truth, and to at least indicate the precipices of inconsistency and self-contradiction to which they conduct the unhappy learner who allows himself to be guided by them." Actuated by the conviction flowing from such considerations as the above, that "a thorough grounding in logic is a most important element" in the intellectual cultivation of the more advanced students in Catholic colleges, and feeling the need for this purpose "of a Catholic text-book of Logic in English, corresponding to those which are in general use in Protestant schools and universities," whose inadequacy has been already pointed out, Father Clarke resolved to compile his treatise on Logic, and his colleagues have been impelled by the same motive to write their various companion treatises. It can now no longer be said that there are no text-books on these subjects either for use in class, where Latin is not the language, or for private study. These latest additions to our literature have, therefore, a wider scope of usefulness than even the best of the Latin treatises which form the basis of the lectures attended by young ecclesiastics; for besides the difficulties of the language, others almost as troublesome are obviated, such as a strange phraseology, technicalities of style, and "complete severance from modern habits of thought and speech," which "render them unintelligible to ordinary students without an elaborate explanation on the part of the teacher," who "has to cover the dry bones with flesh, to enlarge, illustrate, translate, and simplify, and often entirely reconstruct, before he can reach the average intelligence or rouse any interest in his pupils." The English text-books in general use until now, even when orthodox, are not up to the requirements of the time. For the most part literal translations from the Latin, they present the same technical objections as their prototypes, for their editors "have not attempted the further task of translating scholastic into nineteenth century phraseology." It was requisite that our Catholic youth should have a most important branch of study presented to them in a more simple and attractive form. And in doing this Father Clarke and his colleagues have not altogether discarded scholastic terms, but have carefully explained them, and have rendered them into words that convey their meaning to men of average education. In the general plan the scholastic system has been closely adhered to throughout, but it has been clothed in a modern dress. The merest tyro in philosophy may enter at once upon the study of this "Logic," and find it easy and interesting. And by others also are these manuals available. They may prove useful to Protestant students, "perplexed and bewildered by the rival claims of half a dozen different systems, each at variance with the rest, and often also at variance with itself as well," who are "inclined to give up the search for truth in despair and to fall back on the Hamiltonian doctrine of the Relativity of Knowledge, or,

in other words, on the non-existence of truth at all"; for converts to the Catholic Church, who "have unconsciously drunk in a number of principles, some true, some false, from their earliest years, and are often not a little puzzled to discern the true from the false"; and last of all, "to the better educated among young ladies, for," says Father Clarke, "we must remember that in these days the old ideas respecting the limits of feminine education have been not a little modified." He also reminds his readers that in this regard "the change which is being introduced is in many respects only a reassertion of what was common enough in Catholic times. It is an undoubted gain to the cause of truth that women of cultivated tastes should be trained to think correctly, and should have such a knowledge of the principles of logic as may help them thereto. In convent schools and other Catholic institutions the higher education is steadily making way, especially in the United States, and the study of logic is an important element in it."

"The ultimate end aimed at in 'the study of logic' being to train the human mind in exactness of thought," it is time to give an idea of the contents of these two volumes on the subject,—for the second is a work on logic, too, it being a treatise on applied or material logic, as the first-named is on formal, or the elementary principles of, logic. Father Clarke opens with a statement of the province of logic, defines it and states its foundations. Then he deals at length with simple apprehension or conception, with judgment or assent, and lastly with the principles of reasoning or argument. In an appendix is given an account of the Scholastic system of philosophy, on which these manuals are based. To Father Rickaby has been assigned the exposition of a part of applied logic, and his work is separated into two grand divisions, the first being a treatment of the nature of certitude in general, and the second, the special treatment of certitude, under which head come up for consideration the trustworthiness of the sense, and the strength of belief based on human testimony.

If the subsequent volumes of this series keep close to the standard of the two before us, the orthodox English reading public will have within their reach most valuable and effective weapons with which to oppose the sophistries of unbelief.

FREDERICK: CROWN PRINCE AND EMPEROR. A BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH DEDICATED TO HIS MEMORY. By *Rennell Rodd*. With an Introduction by Her Majesty, the Empress Frederick. New York: Macmillan & Co. 1888. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co.

This is a charming book. It is an account of the private life and personal character of the late Emperor Frederick, rather than of his official career. It describes his boyhood and youth, the manner in which his education was conducted, his wooing of Victoria—now the Empress Frederick—in the days of her early girlhood, his marriage to her three years afterwards, his subsequent life while his father (who afterwards became successively King William I., of Prussia, and then William I., German Emperor) was only prince of Prussia.

In subsequent chapters the services rendered by Frederick as a military leader in the war with Austria, and afterwards with France, are briefly but lucidly sketched. But even in this part of his work the object of the writer, evidently, is rather to bring to view the personal character of Frederick than his ability as a general. His humanity, his moderation, his compassion for the suffering, his magnanimity and consideration for the vanquished, his desire to shield as far as possible the peaceful non-combatants of France from the misery incident to the

movements of hostile armies, are all brought prominently forward. So, too, during the interval after the treaty of peace between France and Germany and the death of Emperor William I., the writer chiefly dwells upon Frederick's home life, his interest in the education of his children, his avoidance of intermeddling with political affairs, his visits to England, his warm and intelligent interest in agricultural and other industrial pursuits, his unaffected sympathy with people in the humbler walks of life.

During the latter years of the aged Emperor William's life the Crown Prince Frederick had necessarily to act on different occasions as his father's representative and to speak in his name. But in sketching Frederick's life during this period, his biographer carefully avoids everything of a controversial political character, as he does also in his account of the few short months of the Emperor Frederick's reign. He strives rather to bring to view the nobility of Frederick's character, his high sense of personal responsibility, his tenderness of heart, his patience, and courageous endurance of suffering.

A quotation from his Proclamation to the People of Germany when he succeeded to the throne, and several quotations from his "Rescript" to the Imperial Chancellor, Bismarck, furnish, we believe, important and significant clues to the policy he would have pursued had it pleased God to spare his life.

In the first-mentioned document he says:

"Deeply conscious of the greatness of my task, my sole endeavor will be to . . . make Germany a stronghold of peace, and in harmony with the federal governments, as well as with the constitutional bodies of the Empire and of Prussia, to further the prosperity of my people."

We are well aware that ambitious rulers often veil their intentions with deceptive professions. But Frederick was not insincere and deceitful. There is every reason to believe that he intended to be a constitutional and not an autocratic ruler, and had no desire to enlarge his kingly or imperial power at the expense of the rights of his people. Nor had he any ambition to gratify by needless war. His personal prowess and skill as a military leader had been fully tested and proved. His personal knowledge, too, of the horrors of war caused him to detest it.

Equally significant is the following from his Rescript to Bismarck:

"I am resolved to govern in the Empire and in Prussia with a conscientious observation of the provisions of their respective constitutions."

Of like significance, with regard to the religious question, is the following from the Rescript to Bismarck:

"It is my will that the principle of religious toleration . . . shall continue to extend its protection to all my subjects, to whatsoever religious community and creed they may belong. Every one of them stands equally near my heart, for all of them equally, in the hour of danger, proved their complete devotion."

In the same document the Emperor Frederick thus expresses his ideas of education:

"While, on the one hand, a higher cultivation must be extended to ever-widening circles, we have at the same time to beware of the dangers of half education, of awakening demands which the nation's economic development is unable to satisfy, of neglecting the real business of education in a one-sided effort after increase of knowledge.

"Only a generation growing up on the sound principle of the fear of God, and in simplicity of morals, will possess sufficient power of resistance to counteract the dangers which the whole community incurs in a time of rapid economic development, through the highly luxurious life of individuals."

Preceding the biographical sketch of Frederick is an admirable introduction, in the form of a letter from Victoria (the Empress Frederick) to Mr. Rodd, the biographer. It is truly admirable, both in thought and expression, and elevates the empress in our estimation, as a true, noble woman and wife, far above the opinions we previously have had of her. We cannot omit the following quotation :

" . . . I feel sure that the life of a good and noble man must be interesting to all, and that an example so bright and pure can only do good.

" Those in humbler walks of life who are denied many of the blessings enjoyed by the rich, to whose lot fall the so-called good things of this world, are often apt to imagine that their burden is the hardest to bear, that struggles, and pain, and tears are only for them. These, perhaps, will think differently when they read of sufferings borne with such patience, and of duty cheerfully performed while sickness was undermining the strength of the strong man. . . . "

ANCIENT ROME IN THE LIGHT OF RECENT DISCOVERIES. By *Rodolfo Lanciani*, LL.D. (Harv.), F.R.S., Professor in the University of Greene, etc. With One Hundred Illustrations. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1889. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co.

This superb work is a study of ancient pagan Rome by one who has devoted himself for many years to the work of investigating its remains, and who has had exceptional advantages for prosecuting the work. The scientific archæologist, the investigator of the sources of history and the beginnings of civilization, and the amateur of ancient art, will alike find pleasure and profit in perusing its pages and examining its fac-similes and pictures of ancient remains. By the graphic descriptions of the author, aided by numerous admirable illustrations, the temples and palaces, theatres, forums, its baths, aqueducts, sewers, statues and sculptures, and other works of art, its public squares and suburban villas are brought before our eyes, and its long buried people are made to live over again. The scope of the work and the extensive field it covers may best be understood by a summary statement of its contents. After a lengthy preface, which contains much interesting information respecting successive destructions to which the edifices and ancient remains of Rome were subjected, the first chapter treats of "The Renaissance of Roman Archæological Studies." The second chapter treats of the "Prehistoric Life of Rome," on which, as the author clearly shows, much light has been thrown by recent discoveries of remains whose antiquity reaches far back of the founding of Rome, and dispel many of the doubts that have been raised respecting the truth of the traditions about its founding, and of Romulus as a real person and its actual founder. He traces the origin of its name and of the name of its founder. He shows what were the political and ethnographical condition and divisions of the world when Rome was founded, and that the inhabitants of Italy, Etruria excepted, "had only attained that degree of civilization which is called the civilization of bronze." In the writer's opinion, the origin of Rome must be attributed, plainly not to any deep political thought or inspiration, but to the necessity which compelled Alban shepherds to look for surer and better pasture grounds ; and "that if we cannot admire the pretended political forethought and wisdom of the founders of Rome, we are compelled, at any rate, to admire their manly vigor, their indefatigable energy, which led them in a short time to exchange their pastoral rod for the sceptre of kings, and which turned them, to use the expression of Homer, "from leaders of flocks into leaders of men."

The third chapter treats of the "Sanitary Condition of Ancient Rome." This subject, as the author well says, "is full of practical interest on account of the mighty struggle into which modern Romans have entered against malaria; a plague which seems to be spreading slowly but surely." He is of the opinion that in prehistoric times all the lowlands surrounding the Alban volcanoes, including the Latin districts, were comparatively healthy, owing to the purifying action of telluric fires, of sulphuric emanations and of many kinds of healing springs. He adduces numerous proofs of this. He shows that the now pestilential Campagna must have been thus purified, and declares that this is the only way to explain the presence of a thriving, healthy, strong and very large population in places which, at the end of traditional and the beginning of historic times, are described as pestilential. As for Rome itself, he finds it impossible to credit the truth of Cicero's and Livy's description of it as "salubrious in the midst of a pestilential region." The Palatine and other hills of Rome must, in his opinion, have suffered from the effluvia of the swamps surrounding them, and the boggy quagmires in the valleys which separated them. He finds clear proof of this in the numerous altars and shrines dedicated by the early inhabitants of Rome to the Goddess of Fever and other kindred deities; and after the fall of the Empire, the inhabitants of Rome, raising their eyes to God for help, built a chapel near the Vatican in honor of the Madonna della Febbre—Our Lady of the Fever.

The chief works of sanitary improvement which were constructed in ancient times the author describes in chronological order under the several titles of—I. The Construction of Drains; II. The Construction of Aqueducts; III. The Multiplication and Paving of Roads; IV. The Proper Organization of Public Cemeteries; V. The Drainage and Cultivation of the Campagna; VI. The Organization of Medical Help. In this chapter the civil engineer, the student of sanitary improvements, and the antiquarian, alike, will find much to interest and profit.

We would gladly linger over each of the succeeding chapters of the work, but regard for the limits of space forbids it. Suffice it to say they are replete with rare and valuable information on subjects of great interest, as may be inferred from their respective titles, which are as follows: Public Places of Resort; The Palace of the Cæsars; The House of the Vestals; The Public Libraries of Ancient and Mediæval Rome; The Police and Fire Department of Ancient Rome; The Tiber and the Claudian Harbor; The Campagna; The Disappearance of Works of Art, and their Discovery in Recent Years.

We cannot conclude without remarking that the investigations that have been prosecuted by the present government of Rome, and the other works it has carried forward, involve a loss and a ruthless destruction of monuments of Christian antiquity, which must sadden the heart of every one who at all appreciates what Christianity and Christians have done for mankind. On the lamentable change which has thus been made in Rome, we quote briefly from the author's preface. He says:

" . . . It is useless to deny that the picturesqueness and the main characteristics of the Rome of the Popes are now a matter of the past." Then, speaking of the churches and monasteries, etc., that remain, he says: "We miss their old surroundings. . . . It is impossible to imagine anything more commonplace, and out of keeping, and shabby, and tasteless, than the new quarters which encircle the city of 1870."

The author looks upon this from the point of view of an artist, but still more sorrowful is it when contemplated from a Christian position.

THE WANDERING KNIGHT; HIS ADVENTUROUS JOURNEY; OR, A MÆDÆVAL PILGRIM'S PROGRESS. By *Jean de Cartheny*, Brother in the Religious Order of Mount Carmel, and Canon Theologian of the Diocese of Cambrai. Newly translated into English, under Ecclesiastical Supervision, from the edition of 1572. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co, London: Burns & Oates. 1889.

The allegorical romance, of which the book before us is a translation, is believed by many to have suggested and furnished John Bunyan with materials for his famous work, "The Pilgrim's Progress." Comparing the two, a critic of some reputation recently gave the palm of excellence to "The Pilgrim's Progress," because, in his opinion, it was more imaginative and entertaining, and fuller of striking incidents. These characteristics may all be conceded to John Bunyan's book without at all detracting from the solid merits of the work before us or implying that Bunyan's is really the better book. It can be conceded for the same reason that to very many persons the vivid descriptions of Jules Verne's scenes and incidents during an imaginary voyage under the ocean are more entertaining than the true account of any real voyage. Bunyan's fancy had no law to restrain it, and to him truth was whatever he imagined or believed to be true. But the writer of the work before us could exercise his imagination only within the limits of the actual truth as revealed by God and taught by the Holy Catholic Church.

With respect to the real solid value of the two works there is no room for comparison. "The Wandering Knight" is truthful in the lessons it inculcates, for it follows and embodies the teachings of the infallible Church of Christ. The "Pilgrim's Progress" is a mixture of truth and error, for it is a record only of his own ideas and fancies about subjects which the work before us, there is reason to believe, in great part suggested. Yet while thus solid and fruitfully suggestive of meditations upon subjects of deep practical importance to every one who desires and strives to lead a Christian life, "The Wandering Knight" is also highly interesting and entertaining as well as instructive. It is based upon and is an enlargement of our Divine Lord's parable of the Prodigal Son. Its graphic accounts of the adventures of the Wandering Knight are consistent, truthful, and lucid descriptions of the experiences of a young man who starts forth in quest of enjoyment, with no guide but his own inclinations and passions, drains every cup of pleasure that nature's desires suggest and folly proffers to him, and then finds only bitter, bitter disappointment and self-contempt and regret as the result. But God has not abandoned him, and Divine grace comes to his help, and accepting and corresponding with that grace, he is lifted out of the quagmire of wretchedness into which he plunged himself, is led along the "Narrow Way," is delivered from the perils that beset him on either side, until he obtains the "Gift of Perseverance," reaches the "Mansion of Virtue," and then journeys along the "Way of Peace." The work is highly entertaining, highly instructive, and is replete with solid, practical, and very suggestive Christian lessons.

THE NEW SUNDAY SCHOOL COMPANION. Containing the Catechism; Devotions and Prayers for Church, Home and School; Hymns and Simple Music for Mass and other Solemnities. New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Brothers.

The title of this little manual indicates its contents. It is an excellent hand-book for adults as well as for children. The Catechism it contains is the Catechism prepared and enjoined by order of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore; the other instructions and devotions and prayers are those which for long ages have been sanctioned and approved by the Church.

RUDIMENTS OF HEBREW GRAMMAR. Translated from the seventh Latin edition of Vosen-Kaulen's "Rudimenta" by *H. Gabriels*, Rector of St. Joseph's Seminary, Troy, N. Y. Freiburg in Breisgau: B. Herder, Publisher. 1888. (St. Louis, Mo., 17 South Broadway.) 16mo. Pp. 129. Price, 65 cents.

Vosen's grammar has long enjoyed general favor in the schools of Catholic Germany. It was first published in German in 1853, and ran through six editions in the course of six or seven years. In 1860, when a new edition was called for, the author determined to make his work more widely useful by rewriting it in Latin. But the substance of his book (*interna libelli ratio*, as he himself says in Praefat. A.D. 1860) remained unchanged, as did its popularity also; for the translation seems to have passed through seven more editions. About five years ago, after Dr. Vosen's death, a new reprint being needed, the Freiburg publisher, B. Herder, requested the aid of Dr. Kaulen, one of the best-known biblical scholars of Catholic Germany; and to him we are indebted for an edition in which judicious correction and retrenchment have been happily used. It is an excellent work, and its increase in general favor is attested by the fact that the Vosen-Kaulen Grammar, as it is called, has been reprinted no less than sixteen times within the last five years; so we are informed by Dr. Krieg's valuable periodical (*Literarische Rundschau*, volume of 1888, p. 319).

Dr. Gabriels, of Troy, has done a good work for our American seminaries (in which the study of Hebrew is now made imperative by laws of the last Plenary Council) by translating the Vosen-Kaulen Grammar of Hebrew. The old rules of Bellarmin, Slaughter and others of the old school are too mechanical for our grown youth, though excellent in themselves and most valuable for children or young boys who are to be introduced to the mysteries of the Holy Tongue. But it must be remembered that our seminarians begin this study when they are in the class of philosophy. There is, therefore, no reason why they should be subjected to the mechanical formalism that was expedient for them when they studied Latin grammar or prosody. There are a few statements which, on account of their generality, may mislead the student. On p. 27 it is said: "In the converted Future, the accent *generally* is thrown back to the preceding syllable, and the vowel of the last syllable, if a closed one, is shortened." He then gives as examples *Yomer* (with *Šsere*) and *Vayyomer* (with *Segol*), *Yamòt* (*morietur*) and *Vayyámot* with *o* breve. The assertion is not sufficiently qualified. It should read, not "generally," but "often." And this is the very word (*SAEPE*) used by Dr. Vosen in his translation which we have now before us. ("Rudimenta Linguae Hebraicae," Ed. III., emendata. Friburgi Brisigavorum, 1865, § 27, De Van Conversiro, n. 3.) But the blame of such unqualified statements may be laid at the door of many Hebrew grammarians, even Gesenius himself.

The thanks of our professors and students in ecclesiastical seminaries are eminently due to Dr. Gabriels for his translation of this useful little book.

SHORT INSTRUCTIVE SKETCHES FROM THE LIVES OF THE SAINTS FOR THE USE OF PAROCHIAL AND SUNDAY SCHOOLS, ACADEMIES, ETC. New York: J. Schaeffer, Publisher. 1888.

This little volume is published with the *Imprimatur* of the Most Rev. Archbishop of New York. The "sketches" are brief, concise and well written, and the selection of the Saints whose Lives are thus sketched is judicious.

LEAVES FROM ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM. Selected and translated by *Mary H. Allies*. Edited, with a preface, by *T. W. Allies, Ph.G., S.G.* New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns & Oates. 1889.

Those who have the "Leaves of St. Augustine" will value this volume not only on account of its intrinsic merits, which are very great, but also as a worthy companion to the first mentioned work. St. Augustine and St. Chrysostom belong to the same age, were two of its most brilliant lights amidst a glorious constellation of Saints and Church Fathers. The scenes of their labors were far apart. They were of different thought and race. The one was an African, the other a Greek; their minds were cast in different moulds, and shaped and trained in different schools, the one in the severe logic of the Romans, the other in the polished rhetoric of Greece. Yet they both looked to St. Paul chiefly as their master and exemplar, and represented in their writings different sides or aspects of the great Apostle to the Gentiles; the one developed his doctrine in the form of systematic theology, the other in the way of homiletical theology.

The work before us well brings out the power and surpassing eloquence of St. Chrysostom. It is chiefly made up of judiciously chosen selections from his homilies and discourses—discourses which are models of Christian eloquence, models which might well be studied to-day, and which though few, perhaps none, could hope to equal, yet which might well be imitated so far as individual ability will permit.

In addition to a preface containing a brief but lucid sketch of St. Chrysostom's life and labors, and a list of his numerous writings—perhaps the most numerous of any Church Father of that age, certainly of the Church Fathers in the East—the work consists of three parts.

The first of these parts consists of selections from homilies on texts chiefly taken from St. Matthew's Gospel, and some also from St. Paul's Epistles. The general scope and character of these may be inferred from the title of this part, which is: "The King's Highway." The second part, entitled: "The King's House," consists of selections from homilies on subjects connected with the foundation and nature of the Church, the Priesthood, and the Sacraments. The third part consists of letters of St. Chrysostom, written on different occasions and to different persons, and which are models of Christian epistolary communications.

SHORT INSTRUCTIONS FOR LOW MASSES; OR THE SACRAMENTS EXPLAINED. By *Rev. James Donahoe*, of St Thomas Aquinas' Church, Brooklyn, N. Y. Fr. Pustet & Co.; New York and Cincinnati.

Extravagant as we may seem, we could find no words too strong to commend these admirable "instructions." They are brief, concise, yet comprehensive in their scope and full of important information on the subjects they treat of, lucidly and pointedly imparted.

The instructions on the Sacraments are preceded by a discourse admirable for its clearness and simplicity on the nature, the necessity, the source and effects of Divine Grace. Passing over all the chapters occupied with lucid and edifying explanations and instructions respecting the other Sacraments, the fourteen discourses upon the Sacrament of Matrimony we cannot too highly commend. They embrace the whole subject, so far as it is necessary for the laity to be informed upon it. They are prudent, discreet, yet plain and practical. Without being in the slightest degree controversial, they touch upon and expose every false notion and vicious practice connected with the subject on which they treat.

LITURGY FOR THE LAITY; OR, AN EXPLANATION OF SACRED OBJECTS CONNECTED WITH DIVINE WORSHIP. By *James H. O'Donnell*. *Permissu Superiorum*. New York: P. O'Shea, Publisher, 45 Warren Street. 1888.

This little volume has been compiled, as its title indicates, especially for the use of lay Catholics. It is an unpretentious work, but withal a very instructive and valuable one for those for whose use it is intended. It contains clear and concise explanations of the sacred objects connected with Divine worship, which are constantly seen by worshippers in Catholic churches.

There are already many ably written books upon the subjects which this work treats of, but these are intended chiefly for theological students or for priests. Many of them, too, are in Latin, and even those of them that are in the English language are so erudite, and comprise so many topics that are of immediate concern only to clerics, that the average lay reader is not interested in them.

The compiler of this work has evidently labored conscientiously and faithfully to make his book reliable and valuable. His facts and explanations have been gathered from many different sources, and are presented in a style of great simplicity and clearness. As his book is not intended as a text-book, and is entirely free from technicalities, he omits stating in foot-notes the authorities upon which he relies, but has given, immediately before the table of contents, a long list of the different books he has consulted in preparing this volume.

THE HISTORY OF CONFESSION; OR, THE DOGMA OF CONFESSION VINDICATED FROM THE ATTACKS OF HERETICS AND INFIDELS. Translated from the French of *Rev. Ambrose Guillois* by *Louis de Goesbriand, D.D.* New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1889.

Bishop de Goesbriand is entirely too modest in regard to the part which he has taken in the production of this most useful little work. It is not simply a translation, it is even more than an adaptation, for a goodly part of it is original with the Bishop. He has merely taken Guillois' work as a basis and built thereon what is practically a new superstructure. The form of the French work has been changed, and for the better, too; chapters are substituted for the letters of the original; many things of a merely local or personal character have been retrenched; and the Bishop has added many remarks of his own to the most important chapter of the book, that which treats of the institution of Confession by our Saviour.

The titles of the chapters of this book, "one of the most complete and instructive treatises hitherto written about confession," are: Antiquity of Confession; Confession Found Among the Pagans; Obligation of Confession Established by Jesus Christ; Confession Always Practised in the Church of Christ; Divine Origin of Confession Proved by the Councils of the Church and by Numerous Facts Drawn from the First Ages; Divine Institution of Confession Proved from Reason; Public Confession and Penance as Practised in the Early Ages; Testimonies of Protestantism in Favor of Confession; The Use of Confession; Answer to an Objection; Secret and Seal of Confession.

ST. PATRICK, THE FATHER OF A SACRED NATION. A Lecture. By *Rev. J. F. Loughlin, D.D.* Published for the Church of Our Lady of the Rosary. Philadelphia.

This is an eloquent, lucid and highly edifying exposition of the interior significance of Ireland's history.

RECORDS OF THE ENGLISH CATHOLICS OF 1715. Compiled wholly from original documents. Edited by *John Orlebar Payne, M.A.* London: Burns & Oates. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. 1889.

There has of late been a remarkable awakening of English-speaking Catholics, on both sides of the Atlantic, to the importance of preserving whatever historical documents pertaining to them may still be in existence. In England the work is left entirely to isolated individual efforts, while in America the same method of labor has been supplemented by the organized efforts of societies. The volume before us is a most valuable contribution to English-Catholic history, a worthy continuation of that on the "English Catholic Non-Jurors of 1715," and throws much light upon the sufferings and adventures of English Catholics of that period. The chief sources of the information here given are, in the first place, nearly four hundred wills and letters of administration, and, in the second place, copious extracts from the "Forfeited Estates Papers" kept at the Public Record Office. A copious index of over thirty pages completes the work and illustrates, in a way which nothing else can, the genealogical value of such unpublished and authentic documents as are given in this book.

THE LIFE AND GLORIES OF ST. JOSEPH, HUSBAND OF MARY, FOSTER FATHER OF JESUS, AND PATRON OF THE UNIVERSAL CHURCH. Grounded on the Dissertations of *Canon Antonio Vitali, Father José Moreno*, and other writers. By *Edward Healy Thompson*. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns & Oates. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son.

Mr. Healy Thompson has long since taken rank among the foremost of biographical writers in the English language, and every succeeding work from his pen may now, almost without examination, be set down as a valuable addition to Catholic literature. After careful inspection of the portly and handsome volume before us, the exacting critic is forced to the same conclusion. Though professing to be "a composite work, constructed with materials gathered from various quarters," yet it presents all the charms of originality; that is, as far as any biography or history can be original, the patchwork being so skilfully arranged as not to mar the unity and continuity of the whole. Everything known of the foster father of the Redeemer is given here. In an appendix to this latest addition to the Library of Religious Biography are given the decree of Pius IX. declaring St. Joseph Patron of the Universal Church, and a Prayer to St. Joseph.

THE LIFE AND WRITINGS OF THE RIGHT REVEREND JOHN McMULLEN, D.D., FIRST BISHOP OF DAVENPORT, IOWA. By *Rev. James J. McGovern, D.D.*, with an Introduction by the *Right Reverend John Lancaster Spalding, D.D.*, Bishop of Peoria, Chicago and Milwaukee: Hoffman Brothers. For sale by the author, Box 123, Lockport, Illinois.

Rev. Dr. McGovern has performed a labor of love, a duty which he owed to a noble friend, and has done it well. It is certainly an encouraging sign of the times to see so many works of this character coming from the press, smoothing the path for the future historian of the Church in this country. The only regret we feel is that we have not more works of the kind.

Bishop Spalding's introduction is an able summary of Bishop McMullen's career, combined with a review of the difficulties experienced by a pioneer missionary in this country.

THE LITTLE BOOK OF SUPERIORS. By the author of "Golden Sands." Translated from the ninth French edition by *Miss Ella McMahon*. New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1889.

This little volume contains ample and apposite directions for the guidance of those in charge of religious communities. A brief introduction clearly explains the nature of the work proper, which is divided into six chapters, and followed by an appendix of twenty pages. The first chapter treats of the duties to be fulfilled, the second of the virtues to be practised, the third of the faults to be avoided, the fourth of the obstacles to be overcome, the fifth of the means to be employed, and the sixth of the rewards to be hoped for. The appendix contains the rules and duties of a pious superior, and various thoughts and maxims.

CHARACTERISTICS FROM THE WRITINGS OF ARCHBISHOP ULLATHORNE. With bibliographical introduction arranged by the *Rev. Michael F. Glancey*. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns & Oates. 1889.

The writings of Archbishop Ullathorne are known and highly prized by all English-speaking Catholics. They embrace a very great variety of subjects, all of which are treated with eminent ability and clearness. The selecting from them of characteristic passages must necessarily have been a work of great difficulty. But, difficult as it was, it has been done, and exceedingly well done, in the volume before us.

LETTERS TO PERSONS IN RELIGION. By *St. Francis De Sales*. With introduction by *Bishop Hedley*, and fac-simile of the Saint's handwriting. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns & Oates. 1888.

This volume is the fourth of the English translation of the works of St. Francis De Sales, which are in process of issue from the press of the above-mentioned publishing houses. It comprises a very complete and carefully arranged selection of the holy Doctor's Letters to Religious persons. They are characterized by the attractiveness, sweetness of spirit and depth which are to be found in all his writings.

MEMOIR OF THE LIFE OF THE REV. FRANCIS A. BAKER, Priest of the Congregation of St. Paul. By *Rev. A. F. Hewit*. Seventh Edition. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. 1889.

That a good biography of a worthy subject will always find favor with those for whom it is intended, is shown by the large number of editions through which this memoir has passed. The style is simple, and the direct narrative tells more effectively in praise of its subject than would a eulogy of twice the length. Father Hewit's beautiful memoir of his fellow-priest should find a place in every Catholic library.

CORRECTIONS.—In the number of this REVIEW for October of last year an error occurred in the make-up of Professor Herbermann's article on "The Myths of the 'Dark' Ages." What was intended to be the closing paragraph was erroneously placed immediately after the introduction. It begins, near the foot of page 589, with the words, "This view," etc., and ends with the quotation at the top of the following page.

The article in the January number of the current year entitled, "The So-called Problem of Evil," attributed to Rev. M. A. Walsh, S.J., should be credited to Rev. M. A. Power, S.J.

[70747]

PERIODICAL

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

